

EXHIBIT 1

Robbins Geller Rudman & Dowd LLP



Firm Resume

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION.....	1
ANTITRUST.....	2
Antitrust Attorneys.....	2
Notable Antitrust Achievements and Recoveries.....	7
ADDITIONAL PRACTICE AREAS AND SERVICES.....	9
Securities Fraud.....	9
Shareholder Derivative and Corporate Governance Litigation.....	13
Options Backdating Litigation.....	16
Corporate Takeover Litigation.....	16
Insurance.....	18
Consumer Fraud.....	20
Intellectual Property.....	22
Human Rights, Labor Practices and Public Policy.....	22
Environment and Public Health.....	24
Pro Bono.....	25
E-Discovery.....	26
PROMINENT CASES AND JUDICIAL COMMENDATIONS.....	27
Prominent Cases.....	27
Additional Judicial Commendations.....	34
PRECEDENT-SETTING DECISIONS.....	39
Investor and Shareholder Rights.....	39
Consumer Protection.....	44
Insurance.....	45
ATTORNEY BIOGRAPHIES.....	46
Partners.....	46

Introduction

Robbins Geller Rudman & Dowd LLP (“Robbins Geller” or the “Firm”) is a 200-lawyer firm with offices in Atlanta, Boca Raton, Chicago, Manhattan, Melville, Nashville, San Diego, San Francisco, Philadelphia and Washington, D.C. (www.rgrdlaw.com). The Firm is actively engaged in complex litigation, emphasizing antitrust, securities, consumer, insurance, healthcare, human rights and employment discrimination class actions, as well as intellectual property disputes. The Firm’s unparalleled experience and capabilities in these fields are based upon the talents of its attorneys, who have successfully prosecuted thousands of class action lawsuits and numerous individual cases, recovering billions of dollars.

The Firm’s record of success includes some of the largest recoveries in history, including (i) the largest securities class action recovery: \$7.2 billion (*Enron*); and the largest securities class action recovery following a trial: \$1.575 billion (*HSBC Finance Corp.*).

This successful track record stems from our experienced attorneys, including many who came to the Firm from federal or state law enforcement agencies. The Firm also includes several dozen former federal and state judicial clerks. The depth and breadth of the Firm’s resources are unequalled. With hundreds of highly skilled attorneys and employees, including forensic accountants, economists, damage analysts, investigators, paralegals, database programmers and computer security experts, Robbins Geller is able to give the highest level of attention and professionalism to each case and client.

The Firm is committed to practicing law with the highest level of integrity in an ethical and professional manner. We are a diverse firm with lawyers and staff from all walks of life. Our lawyers and other employees are hired and promoted based on the quality of their work and their ability to treat others with respect and dignity.

We strive to be good corporate citizens and work with a sense of global responsibility. Contributing to our communities and environment is important to us. We often take cases on a pro bono basis and are committed to the rights of workers, and to the extent possible, we contract with union vendors. We care about civil rights, workers’ rights and treatment, workplace safety and environmental protection. Indeed, while we have built a reputation as the finest securities and consumer class action law firm in the nation, our lawyers have also worked tirelessly in less high-profile, but no less important, cases involving human rights and other social issues.

Private antitrust “suits provide a significant supplement to the limited resources available to the Department of Justice for enforcing the antitrust laws and deterring violations.”

- *Reiter v. Sonotone Corp.*, 442 U.S. 330, 344 (1979).

Antitrust

Robbins Geller's antitrust attorneys have successfully prosecuted some of the nation's most complicated antitrust actions. Able to draw on exceptional resources and experience, the Firm's cadre of antitrust specialists are willing and able to bring each case to trial. Several of the Firm's antitrust attorneys, including Patrick J. Coughlin and David W. Mitchell, are former Assistant U.S. Attorneys with extensive criminal and civil trial experience, and the Firm's roll of attorneys includes more than 25 former federal and state judicial clerks. Robbins Geller also features a strong appellate department with U.S. Supreme Court experience.

Robbins Geller has been appointed lead counsel in numerous federal antitrust class actions, and has achieved some of the largest recoveries on behalf of antitrust plaintiffs. For example:

- *Dahl v. Bain Capital Partners, LLC*, No. 07-cv-12388 (D. Mass.). Co-lead counsel. Settled for \$590.5 million.
- *In re Currency Conversion Fee Antitrust Litig.*, 01 MDL No. 1409 (S.D.N.Y.). Co-lead counsel. Settled for \$336 million.
- *Thomas & Thomas Rodmakers, Inc. v. Newport Adhesives & Composites, Inc.* (Carbon Fiber Antitrust Litigation), No. CV-99-07796 (C.D. Cal.). Co-lead counsel. Settled for \$67.5 million.
- *Hall v. NCAA* (Restricted Earnings Coach Antitrust Litigation), No. 94-2392 (D. Kan.). Lead counsel for one of the three classes of coaches. After successful jury trial, settled for more than \$70 million.

Courts have recognized Robbins Geller's attorneys for the results they have achieved. In approving an antitrust class action settlement in which Robbins Geller served as co-lead counsel, the court praised counsel for providing “**extraordinarily high-quality representation**” and for litigating with “**enormous attention to detail and unflagging devotion to the cause.**” *In re Currency Conversion Fee Antitrust Litig.*, 263 F.R.D. 110, 129 (S.D.N.Y. 2009). The judge said the attorneys “**represented the Class with a high degree of professionalism, and vigorously litigated every issue against some of the ablest lawyers in the antitrust defense bar.**” *Id.*

Antitrust Attorneys

Samuel H. Rudman, Partner. Sam Rudman is a founding member of the Firm, a member of the Firm's Executive and Management Committees, and manages the Firm's Manhattan and Melville offices.

Rudman is co-lead counsel in several multi-district antitrust class actions pending in federal courts around the country, including *In re Aluminum Warehousing Antitrust Litig.*, No. 13-md-2481 (S.D.N.Y.), and leads the Firm's litigation teams *In re Domestic Airline Travel Antitrust Litig.*, No. 15-mc-01404 (D.D.C.), and *In re Treasury Sec. Auction Litig.*, No. 15-cv-05794 (S.D.N.Y.).

In addition to antitrust litigation, Rudman's practice focuses on recognizing and investigating securities fraud, and initiating securities and shareholder class actions to vindicate shareholder rights and recover shareholder

losses. A former attorney with the U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission, Rudman has recovered hundreds of millions of dollars for shareholders, including: \$129 million recovery in *In re Doral Fin. Corp. Sec. Litig.*, No. 05 MD 1706 (S.D.N.Y.); \$74 million recovery in *In re First BanCorp Sec. Litig.*, No. 05-CV-2148 (D.P.R.); \$65 million recovery in *In re Forest Labs., Inc. Sec. Litig.*, No. 05-CV-2827 (S.D.N.Y.); and \$50 million recovery in *In re TD Banknorth S'holders Litig.*, No. 2557-VCL (Del. Ch.).

In the *TD Banknorth* litigation, the court appointed Rudman and the Firm to be lead counsel for the plaintiff class only after rejecting as “wholly inadequate” the settlement negotiated for the class by another law firm. When the Firm later achieved a \$50 million recovery for the class, the court stated: “This is one of the cases – there’s probably been a half a dozen since I’ve been a judge that I handled which have – really through the sheer diligence and effort of plaintiffs’ counsel – resulted in substantial awards for plaintiffs, after overcoming serious procedural and other barriers. . . . [I]t appears plainly from the papers that you and your co-counsel have diligently, and at great personal expense and through the devotion of many thousands of hours of your time, prosecuted this case to a successful conclusion.” The court also credited the Firm with raising the inadequacy of the initial settlement.

David W. Mitchell, Partner. David Mitchell is a former Assistant U.S. Attorney in the Southern District of California. While at the U.S. Attorney’s Office, Mitchell worked on cases involving narcotics trafficking, bank robbery, murder-for-hire, alien smuggling, and terrorism. He tried nearly 20 cases to verdict before federal criminal juries and made numerous appellate arguments before the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals.

Mitchell’s practice focuses on antitrust and securities fraud litigation. He leads the Firm’s antitrust benchmark rate litigations as well as the Firm’s pay-for-delay actions. He has served as lead or co-lead counsel in numerous cases and has helped achieve substantial settlements for shareholders. His recent cases include *Dahl v. Bain Capital Partners, LLC*, obtaining more than \$590 million for shareholders, and *In re Payment Card Interchange Fee and Merchant Discount Antitrust Litig.* Currently, Mitchell serves as court-appointed counsel in the ISDAfix Benchmark action, *Alaska Elec. Pension Fund v. Bank of Am. Corp.*, No. 1:14-cv-07126 (S.D.N.Y.), and *In re Aluminum Warehousing Antitrust Litig.*, No. 13 MD 2481 (S.D.N.Y.).

Mitchell is a member of the prestigious Enright Inn of Court and was nationally recognized for his legal work and named an “Antitrust Trailblazer” by *The National Law Journal*, which honored attorneys for their achievements in various specialties. Mitchell was also named to the “Best of the Bar – The Most Outstanding Lawyers in San Diego” list by the *San Diego Business Journal*, the Super Lawyers list, and the 2014 Global Directory of Who’s Who.

Patrick J. Coughlin, Of Counsel. Patrick Coughlin has been lead counsel for several major antitrust and securities matters, including one of the earliest and largest class action securities cases to go to trial, *In re Apple Comput. Sec. Litig.*, No. C-84-20148 (N.D. Cal.). Coughlin also served as co-lead counsel in *In re Payment Card Interchange Fee and Merchant Discount Antitrust Litig.*, 05 MDL No. 1720 (E.D.N.Y.), and is plaintiffs’ trial counsel in the ISDAfix Benchmark antitrust litigation *Alaska Elec. Pension Fund v. Bank of Am. Corp.*, No. 1:14-cv-07126 (S.D.N.Y.).

Coughlin was recently one of the lead attorneys who secured a historic recovery on behalf of Trump University students in two class actions against President Donald J. Trump. The settlement provides \$25 million to approximately 7,000 consumers. This result means individual class members will be eligible for upwards of \$35,000 in restitution. He represented the class on a *pro bono* basis.

Additional prominent complex class actions prosecuted by Coughlin include the *Enron* litigation, in which \$7.2 billion was recovered; the *Qwest* litigation, in which a \$445 million recovery was obtained; and the *HealthSouth* litigation, in which a \$671 million recovery was obtained.

Formerly, Coughlin was an Assistant U.S. Attorney in the District of Columbia and the Southern District of California, handling complex white-collar fraud matters. During this time, Coughlin helped try one of the largest criminal RICO cases ever prosecuted by the United States, *United States v. Brown*, No. 86-3056-SWR (D.D.C.), as well as an infamous oil fraud scheme resulting in a complex murder-for-hire trial, *United States v. Boeckman*, No. 87-cr-00676 (S.D. Cal.).

Coughlin's additional trials involving securities violations include cases against Wells Fargo and California Amplifier. Both cases settled in trial. Cases that settled on the eve of trial include cases against Alcatel and America West. Coughlin has tried more than 50 jury and non-jury trials, including a large private RICO trial against the major tobacco companies on behalf of hundreds of thousands of Ohio Taft-Hartley health and welfare fund participants. Coughlin also helped end the Joe Camel ad campaign, a cartoon ad campaign that targeted children, and secured a \$12.5 billion recovery for the cities and counties of California in the landmark 1998 state settlement with the tobacco companies.

In 2015, *The National Law Journal* recognized Coughlin as an "Antitrust Trailblazer."

Brian O. O'Mara, Partner. Brian O'Mara's practice focuses on complex securities and antitrust litigation. Since 2003, O'Mara has served as lead or co-lead counsel in numerous shareholder and antitrust actions, including: *Bennett v. Sprint Nextel Corp.* (D. Kan.) (\$131 million recovery); *In re CIT Grp. Inc. Sec. Litig.* (S.D.N.Y.) (\$75 million recovery); *In re MGM Mirage Sec. Litig.* (D. Nev.) (\$75 million recovery); *C.D.T.S. No. 1 v. UBS AG* (S.D.N.Y.); *In re Aluminum Warehousing Antitrust Litig.* (S.D.N.Y.); and *Alaska Electrical Pension Fund v. Bank of America Corp.* (S.D.N.Y.).

O'Mara has been responsible for a number of significant rulings, including: *Alaska Elec. Pension Fund v. Bank of Am. Corp.*, 175 F. Supp. 3d 44 (S.D.N.Y. 2016); *Bennett v. Sprint Nextel Corp.*, 298 F.R.D. 498 (D. Kan. 2014); *In re MGM Mirage Sec. Litig.*, 2013 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 139356 (D. Nev. 2013); *In re Constar Int'l, Inc. Sec. Litig.*, 2008 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 16966 (E.D. Pa. 2008), aff'd, 585 F.3d 774 (3d Cir. 2009); *In re Direct Gen. Corp. Sec. Litig.*, 2006 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 56128 (M.D. Tenn. 2006); and *In re Dura Pharm., Inc. Sec. Litig.*, 452 F. Supp. 2d 1005 (S.D. Cal. 2006).

O'Mara is the co-author of *Whether Alleging "Motive and Opportunity" Can Satisfy the Heightened Pleading Standards of the Private Securities Litigation Reform Act of 1995: Much Ado About Nothing*, 1 DePaul Bus. & Com. L.J. 313 (2003).

Prior to joining the Firm, O'Mara served as law clerk to the Honorable Jerome M. Polaha of the Second Judicial District Court of the State of Nevada. He earned a Bachelor of Arts degree from the University of Kansas and a Juris Doctor degree from DePaul University College of Law, where he was the recipient of a CALI Excellence Award in Securities Regulation.

Mark J. Dearman, Partner. Mark Dearman is a partner in the Firm's Boca Raton office. Dearman's practice focuses on consumer fraud, securities fraud, mass torts, antitrust, whistleblower and corporate takeover litigation. Some of Dearman's recent representative cases include: *In re NHL Players' Concussion Injury Litig.*, 2015 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 38755 (D. Minn. 2015); *In re Sony Gaming Networks & Customer Data Sec. Breach Litig.*, 903 F. Supp. 2d 942 (S.D. Cal. 2012); *In re Volkswagen "Clean Diesel" Mktg. Sales Practice, & Prods. Liab. Litig.*, 2016 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 1357 (N.D. Cal. 2016); *In re Ford Fusion & C-Max Fuel Econ. Litig.*, 2015 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 155383 (S.D.N.Y. 2015); *Looper v. FCA US LLC*, No. 5:14-cv-00700 (C.D. Cal.); *In re Aluminum Warehousing Antitrust Litig.*, 95 F. Supp. 3d 419 (S.D.N.Y. 2015), aff'd, 833 F.3d 151 (2d Cir. 2016); *In re Liquid Aluminum Sulfate Antitrust Litig.*, No. 16-md-2687 (D.N.J.); *In re Winn-Dixie Stores, Inc. S'holder Litig.*, No. 16-2011-CA-010616 (Fla. 4th Jud. Cir. Ct., Duval Cty.); *Gemelas v. Dannon Co. Inc.*, No. 1:08-cv-00236 (N.D. Ohio); and *In re AuthenTec, Inc. S'holder Litig.*, No. 05-2012-CA-57589 (Fla. 18th Jud.

Cir. Ct., Brevard Cty.).

Dearman is AV rated by Martindale-Hubbell, and has been recognized as a Florida Super Lawyer in *Super Lawyers Magazine*. He has also been recognized by his peers as being in the top 1.5% of Florida Civil Trial Lawyers as published in *Florida Trend's Florida Legal Elite*.

Prior to joining the Firm, Dearman spent several years defending Fortune 500 companies in all aspects of litigation, with an emphasis in complex commercial litigation, consumer claims, and mass torts (products liability and personal injury). Dearman went on to found the firm of Dearman & Gerson where he continued to defend many publicly traded corporations for over 12 years. Within the last 17 years of practice, Dearman has obtained extensive jury trial experience on the plaintiffs' side, protecting the rights of investors throughout the United States.

Dearman received a Bachelor of Arts degree from the University of Florida. He earned his Juris Doctor degree from Nova Southeastern University. Upon graduation from law school, he worked in the Miami office of Ruden, McClosky, Smith, Schuster & Russell.

Alexandra S. Bernay, Partner. Xan Bernay is a partner in the Firm's San Diego office, where she specializes in antitrust and unfair competition class-action litigation. She has also worked on some of the Firm's largest securities fraud class actions, including the *Enron* litigation, which recovered an unprecedented \$7.3 billion for investors.

Bernay's current practice focuses on the prosecution of antitrust and consumer fraud cases. She was on the litigation team that prosecuted *In re Payment Card Interchange Fee and Merchant Discount Antitrust Litig.* She is also a member of the litigation team involved in *In re Digital Music Antitrust Litig.*, as well as a member of the Co-Lead Counsel team in *Lincoln Adventures, LLC v. Those Certain Underwriters at Lloyd's London*, pending in federal court in New Jersey, where she represents buyers of insurance in an action against insurance companies in the London market. She is also involved in a number of other cases in the Firm's antitrust practice area.

Bernay was actively involved in the consumer action on behalf of bank customers who were overcharged for debit card transactions. That case, *In re Checking Account Overdraft Litig.*, resulted in more than \$500 million in settlements with major banks that manipulated customers' debit transactions to maximize overdraft fees. She was also part of the trial team in an antitrust monopolization case against a multinational computer and software company.

Steven M. Jodlowski, Partner. Steven Jodlowski is a partner in the Firm's San Diego office. Jodlowski has been actively involved in a variety of cases involving consumer fraud, antitrust, employment, and complex insurance class action litigation. Jodlowski has participated in a series of nationwide actions brought against life insurance carriers for fraudulent and deceptive conduct in connection with the marketing and sale of deferred annuities to senior citizens. In two of these matters, federal district courts certified nationwide Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations Act litigation classes comprised of tens of thousands of deferred annuity policyholders, and California subclasses predicated on the same factual allegations. Jodlowski's efforts have resulted in recoveries of nearly \$600 million in benefits for policyholders, including *Negrete v. Allianz Life Ins. Co. of N. Am.* (estimated settlement value of \$250 million), *In re Nat'l W. Life Ins. Deferred Annuities Litig.* (estimated settlement value of \$21.02 million), *In re Midland Nat'l Life Ins. Co. Annuity Sales Practices Litig.* (estimated settlement value of \$79.538 million), *Negrete v. Fidelity & Guar. Life Ins. Co.* (estimated settlement value of \$52.7 million), and *In re Am. Equity Annuity Practices & Sales Litig.* (estimated settlement value of \$129 million). In *Liberty Mutual Overtime Cases*, Jodlowski represented and ultimately helped secure \$65 million for a class of current and former insurance claims adjusters in California.

Jodlowski also represents institutional and individual shareholders in corporate takeover actions and breach of fiduciary litigation in state and federal court. He has handled pre- and post-merger litigation stemming from the acquisition of publicly listed companies in the biotechnology, oil and gas, information technology, specialty retail, electrical, banking, finance and real estate industries, among others. Additionally, Jodlowski served on the trial team in an antitrust monopolization case against a multinational computer and software company and represents individuals and businesses in other antitrust litigation.

Jodlowski received a Bachelor of Management degree in Information Systems from the University of Central Oklahoma. He earned a Juris Doctor degree, *cum laude*, from California Western School of Law. While in law school Jodlowski was a clerk at the Firm and joined Robbins Geller after graduating.

Carmen A. Medici, Partner. Carmen Medici is a partner in the Firm's San Diego office. He represents businesses and consumers who are the victims of price-fixing, monopolization, collusion, and other anticompetitive and unfair business practices. Medici is currently part of the co-lead counsel team prosecuting *In re Payment Card Interchange Fee and Merchant Discount Antitrust Litig.* He is also part of the co-lead counsel team in *Lincoln Adventures, LLC v. Those Certain Underwriters at Lloyd's London*, where Medici represents buyers of insurance in an antitrust action against insurance companies in the London market. He is also a member of the co-lead litigation team in *In re Aluminum Warehousing Antitrust Litig.* Medici was a member of the discovery team in *In re NCAA Student-Athlete Name & Likeness Licensing Litig.*, which culminated in a trial victory for student athletes against the NCAA. He is also on the litigation teams in *In re Fresh & Process Potatoes Antitrust Litig.* and *In re Digital Music Antitrust Litig.* In addition, he is involved in a number of the Firm's other major antitrust and consumer actions. Medici regularly identifies and pursues potential new antitrust matters and drafts complaints on behalf of individual and class plaintiffs.

Medici graduated from Arizona State University in 2003 with a degree in Business Management. In 2006, he received his J.D. from the University of San Diego School of Law. He is licensed to practice law in both Arizona and California.

Lonnie A. Browne, Associate. Lonnie Browne is an associate in the Firm's San Diego office, where his practice focuses on complex antitrust and securities litigation. Among others, Browne is a member of the teams prosecuting *In re Aluminum Warehousing Litig.*, No. 1:13-md-02481 (S.D.N.Y.), *Alaska Elec. Pension Fund v. Bank of America*, No. 14-cv-07126 (S.D.N.Y.), and *In re Text Messaging Antitrust Litig.*, No. 08-cv-07082 (N.D. Ill.).

Browne earned his Bachelor of Arts in History from Stanford University in 2008. After teaching and coaching at Damien High School in La Verne, California, Browne attended the University of San Diego School of Law, receiving his Juris Doctor in 2013. During law school, Browne served as comments editor on the *San Diego International Law Journal* and as a teaching assistant for Professor Alastair J. Agcaoili. Browne also earned a Community Service Grant from the School of Law to work with San Diego's Employee Rights Center and advocate for members of the United Domestic Workers of America. In addition, he worked at the Law Offices of Robert Vaage and served as a judicial extern for the Honorable William McCurine, Jr. of the United States District Court for the Southern District of California.

Vincent M. Serra, Associate. Vincent Serra is an associate at the Firm's Melville office and focuses his practice on complex antitrust, consumer, employment and securities litigation. His efforts have contributed to the recovery of billions of dollars on behalf of aggrieved plaintiffs and class members. Serra has contributed to several significant antitrust recoveries, including *In re Currency Conversion Fee Antitrust Litig.* (\$336 million recovery) and *In re Payment Card Interchange Fee and Merchant Discount Antitrust Litig.*

Serra was also a member of the team of attorneys who recently secured a \$590.5 million settlement on behalf of investors in *Dahl v. Bain Capital Partners, LLC*, an antitrust action against some of the world's largest and most powerful private equity firms in the world alleging collusive practices in multi-billion dollar leveraged buyouts. He is currently litigating with others on the ISDAfix Benchmark case and *In re Treasuries Sec. Auction Antitrust Litig.*, and represents consumers in several actions against manufacturers and retailers for the improper marketing, sale and/or warranting of their products. Additionally, Serra was part of the litigation team that obtained a \$22.75 million settlement fund on behalf of route drivers in an action asserting violations of federal and state overtime laws against Cintas Corp. He was also part of the successful trial team in *Lebrilla v. Farmers Grp., Inc.*, which involved Farmers' practice of using inferior imitation parts when repairing insureds' vehicles. Other notable cases include *Alaska Elec. Pension Fund v. Pharmacia Corp.* (\$164 million recovery) and *In re Priceline.com Sec. Litig.* (\$80 million recovery).

Serra earned his Bachelor of Arts degree in International Relations with a minor in History from the University of Delaware and his Juris Doctor degree from California Western School of Law, where he received the Wiley W. Manuel award for pro bono legal services. He interned and clerked at the Firm during law school.

Notable Antitrust Achievements and Recoveries

Robbins Geller's antitrust practice focuses on representing businesses and individuals who have been the victims of price-fixing, unlawful monopolization, market allocation, tying and other anti-competitive conduct. The Firm has taken a leading role in many of the largest federal and state price-fixing, monopolization, market allocation and tying cases throughout the United States.

- ***Dahl v. Bain Capital Partners, LLC***, No. 07-cv-12388-EFH (D. Mass.). Robbins Geller attorneys served as co-lead counsel on behalf of shareholders in this antitrust action against the nation's largest private equity firms that colluded to restrain competition and suppress prices paid to shareholders of public companies in connection with leveraged buyouts. Robbins Geller attorneys recovered more than \$590 million for the class from the private equity firm defendants, including Goldman Sachs Group Inc. and Carlyle Group LP.
- ***Alaska Elec. Pension Fund v. Bank of America Corp.***, No. 14-cv-07126-JMF (S.D.N.Y.). Robbins Geller attorneys are prosecuting antitrust claims against 13 major banks and broker ICAP plc who are alleged to have conspired to manipulate the ISDAfix rate, the key interest rate for a broad range of interest rate derivatives and other financial instruments in contravention of the competition laws. The class action is brought on behalf of investors and market participants who entered into interest rate derivative transactions between 2006 and 2014. Settlements with eight defendants have collectively yielded more than \$400 million on behalf of investors.
- ***In re Currency Conversion Fee Antitrust Litig.***, 01 MDL No. 1409 (S.D.N.Y.). Robbins Geller attorneys served as lead counsel and recovered \$336 million for a class of credit and debit cardholders. The court praised the Firm as "indefatigable," noting that the Firm's lawyers "vigorously litigated every issue against some of the ablest lawyers in the antitrust defense bar."
- ***Sheet Metal Workers Pension Plan of Northern California v. Bank of America Corporation***, No. 1:16-cv-04603-ER (S.D.N.Y.). Robbins Geller attorneys are serving as co-lead counsel in a case against several of the world's largest banks and the traders of certain specialized government bonds. They are alleged to have entered into a wide-ranging price-fixing and bid-rigging scheme costing pension funds and other investors hundreds of millions. To date, two of the more than a dozen corporate defendants have settled for more than \$65 million.

- ***In re Aftermarket Automotive Lighting Products Antitrust Litig.***, 09 MDL No. 2007 (C.D. Cal.). Robbins Geller attorneys are co-lead counsel in this multi-district litigation in which plaintiffs allege that defendants conspired to fix prices and allocate markets for automotive lighting products. The last defendants settled just before the scheduled trial, resulting in total settlements of more than \$50 million. Commenting on the quality of representation, the court commended the Firm for “expend[ing] substantial and skilled time and efforts in an efficient manner to bring this action to conclusion.”
- ***In re Dig. Music Antitrust Litig.***, 06 MDL No. 1780 (S.D.N.Y.). Robbins Geller attorneys are co-lead counsel in an action against the major music labels (Sony-BMG, EMI, Universal and Warner Music Group) in a case involving music that can be downloaded digitally from the Internet. Plaintiffs allege that defendants restrained the development of digital downloads and agreed to fix the distribution price of digital downloads at supracompetitive prices. Plaintiffs also allege that as a result of defendants' restraint of the development of digital downloads, and the market and price for downloads, defendants were able to maintain the prices of their CDs at supracompetitive levels. The Second Circuit Court of Appeals upheld plaintiffs' complaint, reversing the trial court's dismissal. Discovery is ongoing.
- ***In re Dynamic Random Access Memory (DRAM) Antitrust Litig.***, 02 MDL No. 1486 (N.D. Cal.). Robbins Geller attorneys served on the executive committee in this multi-district class action in which a class of purchasers of dynamic random access memory (or DRAM) chips alleged that the leading manufacturers of semiconductor products fixed the price of DRAM chips from the fall of 2001 through at least the end of June 2002. The case settled for more than \$300 million.
- ***Microsoft I-V Cases***, JCCP No. 4106 (Cal. Super. Ct., San Francisco Cty.). Robbins Geller attorneys served on the executive committee in these consolidated cases in which California indirect purchasers challenged Microsoft's illegal exercise of monopoly power in the operating system, word processing and spreadsheet markets. In a settlement approved by the court, class counsel obtained an unprecedented \$1.1 billion worth of relief for the business and consumer class members who purchased the Microsoft products.

Additional Practice Areas and Services

Securities Fraud

As recent corporate scandals demonstrate clearly, it has become all too common for companies and their executives – often with the help of their advisors, such as bankers, lawyers and accountants – to manipulate the market price of their securities by misleading the public about the company's financial condition or prospects for the future. This misleading information has the effect of artificially inflating the price of the company's securities above their true value. When the underlying truth is eventually revealed, the prices of these securities plummet, harming those innocent investors who relied upon the company's misrepresentations.

Robbins Geller is the leader in the fight to protect investors from corporate securities fraud. We utilize a wide range of federal and state laws to provide investors with remedies, either by bringing a class action on behalf of all affected investors or, where appropriate, by bringing individual cases.

The Firm's reputation for excellence has been repeatedly noted by courts and has resulted in the appointment of Firm attorneys to lead roles in hundreds of complex class-action securities and other cases. In the securities area alone, the Firm's attorneys have been responsible for a number of outstanding recoveries on behalf of investors. Currently, Robbins Geller attorneys are lead or named counsel in hundreds of securities class action or large institutional-investor cases. Some notable current and past cases include:

- ***In re Enron Corp. Sec. Litig.***, No. H-01-3624 (S.D. Tex.). Robbins Geller attorneys and lead plaintiff The Regents of the University of California aggressively pursued numerous defendants, including many of Wall Street's biggest banks, and successfully obtained settlements in excess of **\$7.2 billion** for the benefit of investors. ***This is the largest securities class action recovery in history.***
- ***Jaffe v. Household Int'l, Inc.***, No. 02-C-05893 (N.D. Ill.). As sole lead counsel, Robbins Geller obtained a record-breaking settlement of **\$1.575 billion** after 14 years of litigation, including a six-week jury trial in 2009 that resulted in a securities fraud verdict in favor of the class. In 2015, the Seventh Circuit Court of Appeals upheld the jury's verdict that defendants made false or misleading statements of material fact about the company's business practices and financial results, but remanded the case for a new trial on the issue of whether the individual defendants "made" certain false statements, whether those false statements caused plaintiffs' losses, and the amount of damages. The parties reached an agreement to settle the case just hours before the retrial was scheduled to begin on June 6, 2016. ***The \$1.575 billion settlement, approved in October 2016, is the largest ever following a securities fraud class action trial, the largest securities fraud settlement in the Seventh Circuit and the seventh-largest settlement ever in a post-PSLRA securities fraud case.*** According to published reports, the case was just the seventh securities fraud case tried to a verdict since the passage of the PSLRA.
- ***In re UnitedHealth Grp. Inc. PSLRA Litig.***, No. 06-CV-1691 (D. Minn.). Robbins Geller represented the California Public Employees' Retirement System ("CalPERS") and demonstrated its willingness to vigorously advocate for its institutional clients, even under the most difficult circumstances. The Firm obtained an \$895 million recovery on behalf of the UnitedHealth shareholders, and former CEO William A. McGuire paid \$30 million and returned stock options representing more than three million shares to the shareholders, bringing the total recovery for the class to over \$925 million, the largest stock option backdating recovery ever, and ***a recovery that is more than four times larger than the next largest options backdating recovery.*** Moreover, Robbins Geller obtained unprecedented corporate governance reforms, including election of a shareholder-nominated member to the company's board of directors, a mandatory holding period for

shares acquired by executives via option exercise, and executive compensation reforms that tie pay to performance.

- **Alaska Elec. Pension Fund v. CitiGroup, Inc. (In re WorldCom Sec. Litig.)**, No. 03 Civ. 8269 (S.D.N.Y.). Robbins Geller attorneys represented more than 50 private and public institutions that opted out of the class action case and sued WorldCom's bankers, officers and directors, and auditors in courts around the country for losses related to WorldCom bond offerings from 1998 to 2001. The Firm's attorneys recovered more than \$650 million for their clients, substantially more than they would have recovered as part of the class.
- **Luther v. Countrywide Fin. Corp.**, No. 12-cv-05125 (C.D. Cal.). Robbins Geller attorneys secured a \$500 million settlement for institutional and individual investors in what is the largest RMBS purchaser class action settlement in history, and one of the largest class action securities settlements of all time. The unprecedented settlement resolves claims against Countrywide and Wall Street banks that issued the securities. The action was the first securities class action case filed against originators and Wall Street banks as a result of the credit crisis. As co-lead counsel Robbins Geller forged through six years of hard-fought litigation, oftentimes litigating issues of first impression, in order to secure the landmark settlement for its clients and the class.
- **In re Wachovia Preferred Sec. & Bond/Notes Litig.**, No. 09-cv-06351 (S.D.N.Y.). On behalf of investors in bonds and preferred securities issued between 2006 and 2008, Robbins Geller and co-counsel obtained a significant settlement with Wachovia successor Wells Fargo & Company and Wachovia auditor KPMG LLP. **The total settlement – \$627 million – is one of the largest credit-crisis settlements involving Securities Act claims and one of the 20 largest securities class action recoveries in history.** The settlement is also one of the biggest securities class action recoveries arising from the credit crisis. The lawsuit focused on Wachovia's exposure to "pick-a-pay" loans, which the bank's offering materials said were of "pristine credit quality," but which were actually allegedly made to subprime borrowers, and which ultimately massively impaired the bank's mortgage portfolio. Robbins Geller served as co-lead counsel representing the City of Livonia Employees' Retirement System, Hawaii Sheet Metal Workers Pension Fund, and the investor class.
- **In re Cardinal Health, Inc. Sec. Litig.**, No. C2-04-575 (S.D. Ohio). As sole lead counsel representing Cardinal Health shareholders, Robbins Geller obtained a recovery of \$600 million for investors on behalf of the lead plaintiffs, Amalgamated Bank, the New Mexico State Investment Council, and the California Ironworkers Field Trust Fund. At the time, the \$600 million settlement was the tenth-largest settlement in the history of securities fraud litigation and is the largest-ever recovery in a securities fraud action in the Sixth Circuit.
- **AOL Time Warner Cases I & II**, JCCP Nos. 4322 & 4325 (Cal. Super. Ct., Los Angeles Cty.). Robbins Geller represented The Regents of the University of California, six Ohio state pension funds, Rabo Bank (NL), the Scottish Widows Investment Partnership, several Australian public and private funds, insurance companies, and numerous additional institutional investors, both domestic and international, in state and federal court opt-out litigation stemming from Time Warner's disastrous 2001 merger with Internet high flier America Online. After almost four years of litigation involving extensive discovery, the Firm secured combined settlements for its opt-out clients totaling over \$629 million just weeks before The Regents' case pending in California state court was scheduled to go to trial. The Regents' gross recovery of \$246 million is the largest individual opt-out securities recovery in history.
- **In re HealthSouth Corp. Sec. Litig.**, No. CV-03-BE-1500-S (N.D. Ala.). As court-appointed co-lead counsel, Robbins Geller attorneys obtained a combined recovery of \$671 million from HealthSouth, its auditor Ernst & Young, and its investment banker, UBS, for the benefit of stockholder plaintiffs. The settlement against HealthSouth represents one of the larger settlements in securities

class action history and is considered among the top 15 settlements achieved after passage of the PSLRA. Likewise, the settlement against Ernst & Young is one of the largest securities class action settlements entered into by an accounting firm since the passage of the PSLRA.

- ***Jones v. Pfizer Inc.***, No. 1:10-cv-03864 (S.D.N.Y.). Lead plaintiff Stichting Philips Pensioenfonds obtained a \$400 million settlement on behalf of class members who purchased Pfizer Inc. common stock during the January 19, 2006 to January 23, 2009 class period. The settlement against Pfizer resolves accusations that it misled investors about an alleged off-label drug marketing scheme. As sole lead counsel, Robbins Geller attorneys helped achieve this exceptional result after five years of hard-fought litigation against the toughest and the brightest members of the securities defense bar by litigating this case all the way to trial.
- ***In re Dynegy Inc. Sec. Litig.***, No. H-02-1571 (S.D. Tex.). As sole lead counsel representing The Regents of the University of California and the class of Dynegy investors, Robbins Geller attorneys obtained a combined settlement of \$474 million from Dynegy, Citigroup, Inc. and Arthur Andersen LLP for their involvement in a clandestine financing scheme known as Project Alpha. Most notably, the settlement agreement provides that Dynegy will appoint two board members to be nominated by The Regents, which Robbins Geller and The Regents believe will benefit all of Dynegy's stockholders.
- ***In re Qwest Commc'n Int'l, Inc. Sec. Litig.***, No. 01-cv-1451 (D. Colo.). In July 2001, the Firm filed the initial complaint in this action on behalf of its clients, long before any investigation into Qwest's financial statements was initiated by the SEC or Department of Justice. After five years of litigation, lead plaintiffs entered into a settlement with Qwest and certain individual defendants that provided a \$400 million recovery for the class and created a mechanism that allowed the vast majority of class members to share in an additional \$250 million recovered by the SEC. In 2008, Robbins Geller attorneys recovered an additional \$45 million for the class in a settlement with defendants Joseph P. Nacchio and Robert S. Woodruff, the CEO and CFO, respectively, of Qwest during large portions of the class period.
- ***Fort Worth Emps.' Ret. Fund v. J.P. Morgan Chase & Co.***, No. 1:09-cv-03701 (S.D.N.Y.). Robbins Geller attorneys served as lead counsel for a class of investors and obtained court approval of a \$388 million recovery in nine 2007 residential mortgage-backed securities offerings issued by J.P. Morgan. The settlement represents, on a percentage basis, the largest recovery ever achieved in an MBS purchaser class action. The result was achieved after more than five years of hard-fought litigation and an extensive investigation.
- ***NECA-IBEW Health & Welfare Fund v. Goldman Sachs & Co.***, No. 1:08-cv-10783 (S.D.N.Y.). As sole lead counsel, Robbins Geller obtained a \$272 million settlement on behalf of Goldman Sachs' shareholders. The settlement concludes one of the last remaining mortgage-backed securities purchaser class actions arising out of the global financial crisis. The remarkable result was achieved following seven years of extensive litigation. After the claims were dismissed in 2010, Robbins Geller secured a landmark victory from the Second Circuit Court of Appeals that clarified the scope of permissible class actions asserting claims under the Securities Act of 1933 on behalf of MBS investors. Specifically, the Second Circuit's decision rejected the concept of "tranche" standing and concluded that a lead plaintiff in an MBS class action has class standing to pursue claims on behalf of purchasers of other securities that were issued from the same registration statement and backed by pools of mortgages originated by the same lenders who had originated mortgages backing the lead plaintiff's securities.
- ***Schuh v. HCA Holdings, Inc.***, No. 3:11-cv-01033 (M.D. Tenn.). As sole lead counsel, Robbins Geller obtained a groundbreaking \$215 million settlement for former HCA Holdings, Inc. shareholders – the largest securities class action recovery ever in Tennessee. Reached shortly before trial was

scheduled to commence, the settlement resolves claims that the Registration Statement and Prospectus HCA filed in connection with the company's massive \$4.3 billion 2011 IPO contained material misstatements and omissions. The recovery achieved approximately 70% of classwide damages, which as a percentage of damages significantly exceeds the median class action recovery of 2%-3% of damages.

- ***In re AT&T Corp. Sec. Litig.***, MDL No. 1399 (D.N.J.). Robbins Geller attorneys served as lead counsel for a class of investors that purchased AT&T common stock. The case charged defendants AT&T and its former Chairman and CEO, C. Michael Armstrong, with violations of the federal securities laws in connection with AT&T's April 2000 initial public offering of its wireless tracking stock, the largest IPO in American history. After two weeks of trial, and on the eve of scheduled testimony by Armstrong and infamous telecom analyst Jack Grubman, defendants agreed to settle the case for \$100 million.
- ***Silverman v. Motorola, Inc.***, No. 1:07-cv-04507 (N.D. Ill.). The Firm served as lead counsel on behalf of a class of investors in Motorola, Inc., ultimately recovering \$200 million for investors just two months before the case was set for trial. This outstanding result was obtained despite the lack of an SEC investigation or any financial restatement.
- ***Bennett v. Sprint Nextel Corp.***, No. 2:09-cv-02122 (D. Kan.). As co-lead counsel, Robbins Geller obtained a \$131 million recovery for a class of Sprint investors. The settlement, secured after five years of hard-fought litigation, resolved claims that former Sprint executives misled investors concerning the success of Sprint's ill-advised merger with Nextel and the deteriorating credit quality of Sprint's customer base, artificially inflating the value of Sprint's securities.
- ***Marcus v. J.C. Penney Co., Inc.***, No. 13-cv-00736 (E.D. Tex.). Robbins Geller attorneys obtained a \$97.5 million recovery on behalf of J.C. Penney shareholders. The result resolves claims that J.C. Penney and certain officers and directors made misstatements and/or omissions regarding the company's financial position that resulted in artificially inflated stock prices. Specifically, defendants failed to disclose and/or misrepresented adverse facts, including that J.C. Penney would have insufficient liquidity to get through year-end and would require additional funds to make it through the holiday season, and that the company was concealing its need for liquidity so as not to add to its vendors' concerns.
- ***Garden City Emps.' Ret. Sys. v. Psychiatric Sols., Inc.***, No. 3:09-cv-00882 (M.D. Tenn.). In the *Psychiatric Solutions* case, Robbins Geller represented lead plaintiff and class representative Central States, Southeast and Southwest Areas Pension Fund in litigation spanning more than four years. Psychiatric Solutions and its top executives were accused of insufficiently staffing their in-patient hospitals, downplaying the significance of regulatory investigations and manipulating their malpractice reserves. Just days before trial was set to commence, attorneys from Robbins Geller achieved a \$65 million settlement that was the third-largest securities recovery ever in the district and the largest in a decade.
- ***Plumbers & Pipefitters National Pension Fund v. Burns***, No. 3:05-cv-07393-JGC (N.D. Ohio). After 11 years of hard-fought litigation, Robbins Geller attorneys secured a \$64 million recovery for shareholders in a case that accused the former heads of Dana Corp. of securities fraud for trumpeting the auto parts maker's condition while it actually spiraled toward bankruptcy. The Firm's Appellate Practice Group successfully appealed to the Sixth Circuit Court of Appeals twice, reversing the district court's dismissal of the action.
- ***In re St. Jude Med., Inc. Sec. Litig.***, No. 0:10-cv-00851 (D. Minn.). After four and one half years of litigation and mere weeks before the jury selection, Robbins Geller obtained a \$50 million settlement on

behalf of investors in medical device company St. Jude Medical. The settlement resolves accusations that St. Jude Medical misled investors by utilizing heavily discounted end-of-quarter bulk sales to meet quarterly expectations, which created a false picture of demand by increasing customer inventory due of St. Jude Medical devices. The complaint alleged that the risk of St. Jude Medical's reliance on such bulk sales manifested when it failed to meet its forecast guidance for the third quarter of 2009, which the company had reaffirmed only weeks earlier.

Robbins Geller's securities practice is also strengthened by the existence of a strong appellate department, whose collective work has established numerous legal precedents. The securities practice also utilizes an extensive group of in-house economic and damage analysts, investigators and forensic accountants to aid in the prosecution of complex securities issues.

Shareholder Derivative and Corporate Governance Litigation

The Firm's shareholder derivative and corporate governance practice is focused on preserving corporate assets and enhancing long-term shareowner value. Shareowner derivative actions are often brought by institutional investors to vindicate the rights of the corporation injured by its executives' misconduct, which can effect violations of the nation's securities, anti-corruption, false claims, cyber-security, labor, environmental and/or health & safety laws.

Robbins Geller attorneys have aided Firm clients in significantly enhancing shareowner value by obtaining hundreds of millions of dollars in financial clawbacks and successfully negotiating corporate governance enhancements. Robbins Geller has worked with its institutional clients to address corporate misconduct such as options backdating, bribery of foreign officials, pollution, off-label marketing, and insider trading and related self-dealing. Additionally, the Firm works closely with noted corporate governance consultants Robert Monks, Richard Bennett and their firm, ValueEdge Advisors LLC, to shape corporate governance practices that will benefit shareowners.

Robbins Geller's efforts have conferred substantial benefits upon shareowners, and the market effect of these benefits measures in the billions of dollars. The Firm's significant achievements include:

- ***City of Westland Police and Fire Retirement System v. Stumpf (Wells Fargo Derivative Litigation)***, No. 3:11-cv-02369 (N.D. Cal.). Prosecuted shareholder derivative action on behalf of Wells Fargo & Co. alleging that Wells Fargo's executives allowed participation in the mass-processing of home foreclosure documents by engaging in widespread robo-signing, *i.e.*, the execution and submission of false legal documents in courts across the country without verification of their truth or accuracy, and failed to disclose Wells Fargo's lack of cooperation in a federal investigation into the bank's mortgage and foreclosure practices. In settlement of the action, Wells Fargo agreed to provide \$67 million in homeowner down-payment assistance, credit counseling and improvements to its mortgage servicing system. The initiatives will be concentrated in cities severely impacted by the bank's foreclosure practices and the ensuing mortgage foreclosure crisis. Additionally, Wells Fargo agreed to change its procedures for reviewing shareholder proposals and a strict ban on stock pledges by Wells Fargo board members.
- ***In re Ormat Techs., Inc. Derivative Litig.***, No. CV10-00759 (Nev. Dist. Ct., Washoe Cty.). Robbins Geller brought derivative claims for breach of fiduciary duty and unjust enrichment against the directors and certain officers of Ormat Technologies, Inc., a leading geothermal and recovered energy power business. During the relevant time period, these Ormat insiders caused the company to engage in accounting manipulations that ultimately required restatement of the company's financial statements. The settlement in this action includes numerous corporate governance reforms designed to, among

other things: (i) increase director independence; (ii) provide continuing education to directors; (iii) enhance the company's internal controls; (iv) make the company's board more independent; and (iv) strengthen the company's internal audit function.

- ***In re Alphatec Holdings, Inc. Derivative S'holder Litig.***, No. 37-2010-00058586 (Cal. Super. Ct., San Diego Cty.). Obtained sweeping changes to Alphatec's governance, including separation of the Chairman and CEO positions, enhanced conflict of interest procedures to address related-party transactions, rigorous director independence standards requiring that at least a majority of directors be outside independent directors, and ongoing director education and training.
- ***In re Finisar Corp. Derivative Litig.***, No. C-06-07660 (N.D. Cal.). Prosecuted shareholder derivative action on behalf of Finisar against certain of its current and former directors and officers for engaging in an alleged nearly decade-long stock option backdating scheme that was alleged to have inflicted substantial damage upon Finisar. After obtaining a reversal of the district court's order dismissing the complaint for failing to adequately allege that a pre-suit demand was futile, Robbins Geller lawyers successfully prosecuted the derivative claims to resolution obtaining over \$15 million in financial clawbacks for Finisar. Robbins Geller attorneys also obtained significant changes to Finisar's stock option granting procedures and corporate governance. As a part of the settlement, Finisar agreed to ban the repricing of stock options without first obtaining specific shareholder approval, prohibit the retrospective selection of grant dates for stock options and similar awards, limit the number of other boards on which Finisar directors may serve, require directors to own a minimum amount of Finisar shares, annually elect a Lead Independent Director whenever the position of Chairman and CEO are held by the same person, and require the board to appoint a Trading Compliance officer responsible for ensuring compliance with Finisar's insider trading policies.
- ***Loizides v. Schramm (Maxwell Technology Derivative Litigation)***, No. 37-2010-00097953 (Cal. Super. Ct., San Diego Cty.). Prosecuted shareholder derivative claims arising from the company's alleged violations of the Foreign Corrupt Practices Act of 1977 ("FCPA"). As a result of Robbins Geller's efforts, Maxwell insiders agreed to adopt significant changes in Maxwell's internal controls and systems designed to protect Maxwell against future potential violations of the FCPA. These corporate governance changes included, establishing the following, among other things: a compliance plan to improve board oversight of Maxwell's compliance processes and internal controls; a clear corporate policy prohibiting bribery and subcontracting kickbacks, whereby individuals are accountable; mandatory employee training requirements, including the comprehensive explanation of whistleblower provisions, to provide for confidential reporting of FCPA violations or other corruption; enhanced resources and internal control and compliance procedures for the audit committee to act quickly if an FCPA violation or other corruption is detected; an FCPA and Anti-Corruption Compliance department that has the authority and resources required to assess global operations and detect violations of the FCPA and other instances of corruption; a rigorous ethics and compliance program applicable to all directors, officers and employees, designed to prevent and detect violations of the FCPA and other applicable anti-corruption laws; an executive-level position of Chief Compliance Officer with direct board-level reporting responsibilities, who shall be responsible for overseeing and managing compliance issues within the company; a rigorous insider trading policy buttressed by enhanced review and supervision mechanisms and a requirement that all trades are timely disclosed; and enhanced provisions requiring that business entities are only acquired after thorough FCPA and anti-corruption due diligence by legal, accounting and compliance personnel at Maxwell.

- ***In re SciClone Pharm., Inc. S'holder Derivative Litig.***, No. CIV 499030 (Cal. Super. Ct., San Mateo Cty.). Robbins Geller attorneys successfully prosecuted the derivative claims on behalf of nominal party SciClone Pharmaceuticals, Inc., resulting in the adoption of state-of-the-art corporate governance reforms. The corporate governance reforms included the establishment of an FCPA compliance coordinator; the adoption of an FCPA compliance program and code; and the adoption of additional internal controls and compliance functions.
- ***Policemen & Firemen Ret. Sys. of the City of Detroit v. Cornelison (Halliburton Derivative Litigation)***, No. 2009-29987 (Tex. Dist. Ct., Harris Cty.). Prosecuted shareholder derivative claims on behalf of Halliburton Company against certain Halliburton insiders for breaches of fiduciary duty arising from Halliburton's alleged violations of the FCPA. In the settlement, Halliburton agreed, among other things, to adopt strict intensive controls and systems designed to detect and deter the payment of bribes and other improper payments to foreign officials, to enhanced executive compensation clawback, director stock ownership requirements, a limitation on the number of other boards that Halliburton directors may serve, a lead director charter, enhanced director independence standards, and the creation of a management compliance committee.
- ***In re UnitedHealth Grp. Inc. PSLRA Litig.***, No. 06-CV-1691 (D. Minn.). In the *UnitedHealth* case, our client, CalPERS, obtained sweeping corporate governance improvements, including the election of a shareholder-nominated member to the company's board of directors, a mandatory holding period for shares acquired by executives via option exercises, as well as executive compensation reforms that tie pay to performance. In addition, the class obtained \$925 million, the largest stock option backdating recovery ever and four times the next largest options backdating recovery.
- ***In re Fossil, Inc. Derivative Litig.***, No. 3:06-cv-01672 (N.D. Tex.). The settlement agreement included the following corporate governance changes: declassification of elected board members; retirement of three directors and addition of five new independent directors; two-thirds board independence requirements; corporate governance guidelines providing for "Majority Voting" election of directors; lead independent director requirements; revised accounting measurement dates of options; addition of standing finance committee; compensation clawbacks; director compensation standards; revised stock option plans and grant procedures; limited stock option granting authority, timing and pricing; enhanced education and training; and audit engagement partner rotation and outside audit firm review.
- ***Pirelli Armstrong Tire Corp. Retiree Med. Benefits Tr. v. Sinegal (Costco Derivative Litigation)***, No. 2:08-cv-01450 (W.D. Wash.). The parties agreed to settlement terms providing for the following corporate governance changes: the amendment of Costco's bylaws to provide "Majority Voting" election of directors; the elimination of overlapping compensation and audit committee membership on common subject matters; enhanced Dodd-Frank requirements; enhanced internal audit standards and controls, and revised information-sharing procedures; revised compensation policies and procedures; revised stock option plans and grant procedures; limited stock option granting authority, timing and pricing; and enhanced ethics compliance standards and training.
- ***In re F5 Networks, Inc. Derivative Litig.***, No. C-06-0794 (W.D. Wash.). The parties agreed to the following corporate governance changes as part of the settlement: revised stock option plans and grant procedures; limited stock option granting authority, timing and pricing; "Majority Voting" election of directors; lead independent director requirements; director independence standards; elimination of director perquisites; and revised compensation practices.

Options Backdating Litigation

As has been widely reported in the media, the stock options backdating scandal suddenly engulfed hundreds of publicly traded companies throughout the country in 2006. Robbins Geller was at the forefront of investigating and prosecuting options backdating derivative and securities cases. The Firm has recovered over \$1 billion in damages on behalf of injured companies and shareholders.

- ***In re KLA-Tencor Corp. S'holder Derivative Litig.***, No. C-06-03445 (N.D. Cal.). After successfully opposing the special litigation committee of the board of directors' motion to terminate the derivative claims, Robbins Geller recovered \$43.6 million in direct financial benefits for KLA-Tencor, including \$33.2 million in cash payments by certain former executives and their directors' and officers' insurance carriers.
- ***In re Marvell Technology Grp. Ltd. Derivative Litig.***, No. C-06-03894 (N.D. Cal.). Robbins Geller recovered \$54.9 million in financial benefits, including \$14.6 million in cash, for Marvell, in addition to extensive corporate governance reforms related to Marvell's stock option granting practices, board of directors' procedures and executive compensation.
- ***In re KB Home S'holder Derivative Litig.***, No. 06-CV-05148 (C.D. Cal.). Robbins Geller served as co-lead counsel for the plaintiffs and recovered more than \$31 million in financial benefits, including \$21.5 million in cash, for KB Home, plus substantial corporate governance enhancements relating to KB Home's stock option granting practices, director elections and executive compensation practices.

Corporate Takeover Litigation

Robbins Geller has earned a reputation as the leading law firm in representing shareholders in corporate takeover litigation. Through its aggressive efforts in prosecuting corporate takeovers, the Firm has secured for shareholders billions of dollars of additional consideration as well as beneficial changes for shareholders in the context of mergers and acquisitions.

The Firm regularly prosecutes merger and acquisition cases post-merger, often through trial, to maximize the benefit for its shareholder class. Some of these cases include:

- ***In re Kinder Morgan, Inc. S'holders Litig.***, No. 06-C-801 (Kan. Dist. Ct., Shawnee Cty.). In the largest recovery ever for corporate takeover class action litigation, the Firm negotiated a settlement fund of \$200 million in 2010.
- ***In re Dole Food Co., Inc. Stockholder Litig.***, No. 8703-VCL (Del. Ch.). Robbins Geller and co-counsel went to trial in the Delaware Court of Chancery on claims of breach of fiduciary duty on behalf of Dole Food Co., Inc. shareholders. The litigation challenged the 2013 buyout of Dole by its billionaire Chief Executive Officer and Chairman, David H. Murdock. On August 27, 2015, the court issued a post-trial ruling that Murdock and fellow director C. Michael Carter – who also served as Dole's General Counsel, Chief Operating Officer and Murdock's top lieutenant – had engaged in fraud and other misconduct in connection with the buyout and are liable to Dole's former stockholders for over \$148 million, the largest trial verdict ever in a class action challenging a merger transaction.
- ***Nieman v. Duke Energy Corp.***, No. 3:12-cv-00456 (W.D.N.C.). Robbins Geller, along with co-counsel, obtained a \$146.25 million settlement on behalf of Duke Energy Corporation investors. The settlement resolves accusations that defendants misled investors regarding Duke's future leadership following its merger with Progress Energy, Inc., and specifically, their premeditated coup to oust William

D. Johnson (CEO of Progress) and replace him with Duke's then-CEO, John Rogers. This historic settlement represents the largest recovery ever in a North Carolina securities fraud action, and one of the five largest recoveries in the Fourth Circuit.

- ***In re Rural Metro Corp. Stockholders Litig.***, No. 6350-VCL (Del. Ch.). Robbins Geller and co-counsel were appointed lead counsel in this case after successfully objecting to an inadequate settlement that did not take into account evidence of defendants' conflicts of interest. In a post-trial opinion, Delaware Vice Chancellor J. Travis Laster found defendant RBC Capital Markets, LLC liable for aiding and abetting Rural/Metro's board of directors' fiduciary duty breaches in the \$438 million buyout of Rural/Metro, citing "the magnitude of the conflict between RBC's claims and the evidence." RBC was ordered to pay nearly \$110 million as a result of its wrongdoing, the largest damage award ever obtained against a bank over its role as a merger adviser. The Delaware Supreme Court issued a landmark opinion affirming the judgment on November 30, 2015, *RBC Capital Mkts., LLC v. Jervis*, 129 A.3d 816 (Del. 2015).
- ***In re Del Monte Foods Co. S'holders Litig.***, No. 6027-VCL (Del. Ch.). Robbins Geller exposed the unseemly practice by investment bankers of participating on both sides of large merger and acquisition transactions and ultimately secured an \$89 million settlement for shareholders of Del Monte. For efforts in achieving these results, the Robbins Geller lawyers prosecuting the case were named Attorneys of the Year by *California Lawyer* magazine in 2012.
- ***In re TD Banknorth S'holders Litig.***, No. 2557-VCL (Del. Ch.). After objecting to a modest recovery of just a few cents per share, the Firm took over the litigation and obtained a common fund settlement of \$50 million.
- ***In re Chaparral Res., Inc. S'holders Litig.***, No. 2633-VCL (Del. Ch.). After a full trial and a subsequent mediation before the Delaware Chancellor, the Firm obtained a common fund settlement of \$41 million (or 45% increase above merger price) for both class and appraisal claims.
- ***Laborers' Local #231 Pension Fund v. Websense, Inc.***, No. 37-2013-00050879-CU-BT-CTL (Cal. Super. Ct., San Diego Cty.). Robbins Geller successfully obtained a record-breaking \$40 million in *Websense, Inc.*, which is believed to be the largest post-merger common fund settlement in California state court history. The class action challenged the May 2013 buyout of Websense by Vista Equity Partners (and affiliates) for \$24.75 per share and alleged breach of fiduciary duty against the former Websense Board of Directors, and aiding and abetting against Websense's financial advisor, Merrill Lynch, Pierce, Fenner & Smith, Inc. Claims were pursued by the plaintiff in both California state court and the Delaware Court of Chancery.
- ***In re Onyx Pharm., Inc. S'holder Litig.***, No. CIV523789 (Cal. Super. Ct., San Mateo Cty.). Robbins Geller obtained \$30 million in a case against the former Onyx Board of Directors for breaching its fiduciary duties in connection with the acquisition of Onyx by Amgen Inc. for \$125 per share at the expense of shareholders. At the time of the settlement, it was believed to set the record for the largest post-merger common fund settlement in California state court history. Over the case's three years, Robbins Geller defeated defendants' motions to dismiss, obtained class certification, took over 20 depositions and reviewed over one million pages of documents. Further, the settlement was reached just days before a hearing on the defendants' motion for summary judgment was set to take place, and the result is now believed to be the second largest post-merger common fund settlement in California state court history.
- ***Harrah's Entertainment***, No. A529183 (Nev. Dist. Ct., Clark Cty.). The Firm's active prosecution of the case on several fronts, both in federal and state court, assisted Harrah's shareholders in securing an additional \$1.65 billion in merger consideration.

- ***In re Chiron S'holder Deal Litig.***, No. RG 05-230567 (Cal. Super. Ct., Alameda Cty.). The Firm's efforts helped to obtain an additional \$800 million in increased merger consideration for Chiron shareholders.
- ***In re Dollar Gen. Corp. S'holder Litig.***, No. 07MD-1 (Tenn. Cir. Ct., Davidson Cty.). As lead counsel, the Firm secured a recovery of up to \$57 million in cash for former Dollar General shareholders on the eve of trial.
- ***In re Prime Hospitality, Inc. S'holders Litig.***, No. 652-N (Del. Ch.). The Firm objected to a settlement that was unfair to the class and proceeded to litigate breach of fiduciary duty issues involving a sale of hotels to a private equity firm. The litigation yielded a common fund of \$25 million for shareholders.
- ***In re UnitedGlobalCom, Inc. S'holder Litig.***, No. 1012-VCS (Del. Ch.). The Firm secured a common fund settlement of \$25 million just weeks before trial.
- ***In re eMachines, Inc. Merger Litig.***, No. 01-CC-00156 (Cal. Super. Ct., Orange Cty.). After four years of litigation, the Firm secured a common fund settlement of \$24 million on the brink of trial.
- ***In re PeopleSoft, Inc. S'holder Litig.***, No. RG-03100291 (Cal. Super. Ct., Alameda Cty.). The Firm successfully objected to a proposed compromise of class claims arising from takeover defenses by PeopleSoft, Inc. to thwart an acquisition by Oracle Corp., resulting in shareholders receiving an increase of over \$900 million in merger consideration.
- ***ACS S'holder Litig.***, No. CC-09-07377-C (Tex. Cty. Ct., Dallas Cty.). The Firm forced ACS's acquirer, Xerox, to make significant concessions by which shareholders would not be locked out of receiving more money from another buyer.

Insurance

Fraud and collusion in the insurance industry by executives, agents, brokers, lenders and others is one of the most costly crimes in the United States. Some experts have estimated the annual cost of white collar crime in the insurance industry to be over \$120 billion nationally. Recent legislative proposals seek to curtail anti-competitive behavior within the industry. However, in the absence of comprehensive regulation, Robbins Geller has played a critical role as private attorney general in protecting the rights of consumers against insurance fraud and other unfair business practices within the insurance industry.

Robbins Geller attorneys have long been at the forefront of litigating race discrimination issues within the life insurance industry. For example, the Firm has fought the practice by certain insurers of charging African-Americans and other people of color more for life insurance than similarly situated Caucasians. The Firm recovered over \$400 million for African-Americans and other minorities as redress for civil rights abuses, including landmark recoveries in *McNeil v. American General Life & Accident Insurance Company*; *Thompson v. Metropolitan Life Insurance Company*; and *Williams v. United Insurance Company of America*.

The Firm's attorneys fight on behalf of elderly victims targeted for the sale of deferred annuity products with hidden sales loads and illusory bonus features. Sales agents for life insurance companies such as Allianz Life Insurance Company of North America, Midland National Life Insurance Company, and National Western Life Insurance Company targeted senior citizens for these annuities with lengthy investment horizons and high sales commissions. The Firm recovered millions of dollars for elderly victims and seeks to ensure that senior citizens are afforded full and accurate information regarding deferred annuities.

Robbins Geller attorneys also stopped the fraudulent sale of life insurance policies based on misrepresentations about how the life insurance policy would perform, the costs of the policy, and whether premiums would "vanish." Purchasers were also misled about the financing of a new life insurance policy, falling victim to a "replacement" or "churning" sales scheme where they were convinced to use loans, partial surrenders or withdrawals of cash values from an existing permanent life insurance policy to purchase a new policy.

- **Brokerage "Pay to Play" Cases.** On behalf of individuals, governmental entities, businesses, and non-profits, Robbins Geller has sued the largest commercial and employee benefit insurance brokers and insurers for unfair and deceptive business practices. While purporting to provide independent, unbiased advice as to the best policy, the brokers failed to adequately disclose that they had entered into separate "pay to play" agreements with certain third-party insurance companies. These agreements provide additional compensation to the brokers based on such factors as profitability, growth and the volume of insurance that they place with a particular insurer, and are akin to a profit-sharing arrangement between the brokers and the insurance companies. These agreements create a conflict of interest since the brokers have a direct financial interest in selling their customers only the insurance products offered by those insurance companies with which the brokers have such agreements.

Robbins Geller attorneys were among the first to uncover and pursue the allegations of these practices in the insurance industry in both state and federal courts. On behalf of the California Insurance Commissioner, the Firm brought an injunctive case against the biggest employee benefit insurers and local San Diego brokerage, ULR, which resulted in major changes to the way they did business. The Firm also sued on behalf of the City and County of San Francisco to recover losses due to these practices. Finally, Robbins Geller represents a putative nationwide class of individuals, businesses, employers, and governmental entities against the largest brokerage houses and insurers in the nation. To date, the Firm has obtained over \$200 million on behalf of policyholders and enacted landmark business reforms.

- **Discriminatory Credit Scoring and Redlining Cases.** Robbins Geller attorneys have prosecuted cases concerning nationwide schemes of alleged discrimination carried out by Nationwide, Allstate, and other insurance companies against African-American and other persons of color who are purchasers of homeowner and automobile insurance policies. Such discrimination includes alleged redlining and the improper use of "credit scores," which disproportionately impact minority communities. Plaintiffs in these actions have alleged that the insurance companies' corporate-driven scheme of intentional racial discrimination includes refusing coverage and/or charging them higher premiums for homeowners and automobile insurance. On behalf of the class of aggrieved policyholders, the Firm has recovered over \$400 million for these predatory and racist policies.

- **Senior Annuities.** Robbins Geller has prosecuted numerous cases against insurance companies and their agents who targeted senior citizens for the sale of deferred annuities. Plaintiffs alleged that the insurers misrepresented or failed to disclose to senior consumers material facts concerning the costs associated with their fixed and equity indexed deferred annuities and enticed seniors to buy the annuities by promising them illusory up-front bonuses. As a result of the Firm's efforts, hundreds of millions of dollars in economic relief has been made available to seniors who have been harmed by these practices. Notable recoveries include:

- **Negrete v. Allianz Life Ins. Co. of N. Am.**, No. CV-05-6838 (C.D. Cal.). Robbins Geller attorneys served as co-lead counsel on behalf of a nationwide RICO class consisting of over 200,000 senior citizens who had purchased deferred annuities issued by Allianz Life Insurance Company of North America. In March 2015, after nine years of litigation, District Judge Christina A. Snyder granted final approval of a class action settlement that made available in excess of \$250 million in cash payments and other benefits to class members. In approving the settlement, the Court praised the effort of the Firm and noted that “counsel has represented their clients with great skill and they are to be complimented.”
- **In re Am. Equity Annuity Practices & Sales Litig.**, No. CV-05-6735 (C.D. Cal.). As co-lead counsel, Robbins Geller attorneys secured a settlement that made available \$129 million in economic benefits to a nationwide class of 114,000 senior citizens.
- **In re Midland Nat'l Life Ins. Co. Annuity Sales Practices Litig.**, MDL No. 07-1825 (C.D. Cal.). After four years of litigation, the Firm secured a settlement that made available \$79.5 million in economic benefits to a nationwide class of 70,000 senior citizens.
- **Negrete v. Fidelity & Guar. Life Ins. Co.**, No. CV-05-6837 (C.D. Cal.). The Firm’s efforts resulted in a settlement under which Fidelity made available \$52.7 in benefits to 56,000 class members across the country.
- **In re Nat'l Western Life Ins. Deferred Annuities Litig.**, No. 05-CV-1018 (S.D. Cal.). The Firm litigated this action for more than eight years. On the eve of trial, the Firm negotiated a settlement providing over \$21 million in value to a nationwide class of 12,000 senior citizens.

Consumer Fraud

In our consumer-based economy, working families who purchase products and services must receive truthful information so they can make meaningful choices about how to spend their hard-earned money. When financial institutions and other corporations deceive consumers or take advantage of unequal bargaining power, class action suits provide, in many instances, the only realistic means for an individual to right a corporate wrong.

Robbins Geller attorneys represent consumers around the country in a variety of important, complex class actions. Our attorneys have taken a leading role in many of the largest federal and state consumer fraud, environmental, human rights and public health cases throughout the United States. The Firm is also actively involved in many cases relating to banks and the financial services industry, pursuing claims on behalf of individuals victimized by abusive telemarketing practices, abusive mortgage lending practices, market timing violations in the sale of variable annuities, and deceptive consumer credit lending practices in violation of the Truth-In-Lending Act. Below are a few representative samples of our robust, nationwide consumer practice.

- **Trump University.** After six and half years of tireless litigation and on the eve of trial, Robbins Geller, serving as co-lead counsel, secured a historic recovery on behalf of Trump University students around the country. The settlement provides \$25 million to approximately 7,000 consumers, including senior citizens who accessed retirement accounts and maxed out credit cards to enroll in Trump University. The extraordinary result means individual class members will be eligible for upwards of \$35,000 in restitution. The settlement resolves claims that President Donald J. Trump and Trump University violated federal and state laws by misleadingly marketing “Live Events” seminars and mentorships as teaching Trump’s “real-estate techniques” through his “hand-picked” “professors” at his so-called “university.” Robbins Geller represented the class on a *pro bono* basis.

- **Bank Overdraft Fees Litigation.** The banking industry charges consumers exorbitant amounts for “overdraft” of their checking accounts, even if the customer did not authorize a charge beyond the available balance and even if the account would not have been overdrawn had the transactions been ordered chronologically as they occurred – that is, banks reorder transactions to maximize such fees. The Firm brought lawsuits against major banks to stop this practice and recover these false fees. These cases have recovered over \$500 million thus far from a dozen banks and we continue to investigate other banks engaging in this practice.
- **Visa and MasterCard Fees.** After years of litigation and a six-month trial, Robbins Geller attorneys won one of the largest consumer-protection verdicts ever awarded in the United States. The Firm's attorneys represented California consumers in an action against Visa and MasterCard for intentionally imposing and concealing a fee from cardholders. The court ordered Visa and MasterCard to return \$800 million in cardholder losses, which represented 100% of the amount illegally taken, plus 2% interest. In addition, the court ordered full disclosure of the hidden fee.
- **West Telemarketing Case.** Robbins Geller attorneys secured a \$39 million settlement for class members caught up in a telemarketing scheme where consumers were charged for an unwanted membership program after purchasing Tae-Bo exercise videos. Under the settlement, consumers were entitled to claim between one and one-half to three times the amount of all fees they unknowingly paid.
- **Dannon Activia®.** Robbins Geller attorneys secured the largest ever settlement for a false advertising case involving a food product. The case alleged that Dannon's advertising for its Activia® and DanActive® branded products and their benefits from “probiotic” bacteria were overstated. As part of the nationwide settlement, Dannon agreed to modify its advertising and establish a fund of up to \$45 million to compensate consumers for their purchases of Activia® and DanActive®.
- **Mattel Lead Paint Toys.** In 2006-2007, toy manufacturing giant Mattel and its subsidiary Fisher-Price announced the recall of over 14 million toys made in China due to hazardous lead and dangerous magnets. Robbins Geller attorneys filed lawsuits on behalf of millions of parents and other consumers who purchased or received toys for children that were marketed as safe but were later recalled because they were dangerous. The Firm's attorneys reached a landmark settlement for millions of dollars in refunds and lead testing reimbursements, as well as important testing requirements to ensure that Mattel's toys are safe for consumers in the future.
- **Tenet Healthcare Cases.** Robbins Geller attorneys were co-lead counsel in a class action alleging a fraudulent scheme of corporate misconduct, resulting in the overcharging of uninsured patients by the Tenet chain of hospitals. The Firm's attorneys represented uninsured patients of Tenet hospitals nationwide who were overcharged by Tenet's admittedly “aggressive pricing strategy,” which resulted in price gouging of the uninsured. The case was settled with Tenet changing its practices and making refunds to patients.
- **Pet Food Products Liability Litigation.** Robbins Geller served as co-lead counsel in this massive, 100+ case products liability MDL in the District of New Jersey concerning the death of and injury to thousands of the nation's cats and dogs due to tainted pet food. The case settled for \$24 million.
- **Sony Gaming Networks & Customer Data Security Breach Litigation.** The Firm served as a member of the Plaintiffs' Steering Committee, helping to obtain a precedential opinion denying in part Sony's motion to dismiss plaintiffs' claims involving the breach of Sony's gaming network, leading to a pending \$15 million settlement.
- **Volkswagen “Clean Diesel” Marketing, Sales Practices, and Products Liability Litigation.** As part of the Plaintiffs' Steering Committee, Robbins Geller reached a series of settlements on behalf

of purchasers, lessees and dealers that total well over \$17 billion, the largest settlement in history, concerning illegal “defeat devices” that Volkswagen installed on many of its diesel-engine vehicles. The device tricked regulators into believing the cars were complying with emissions standards, while the cars were actually emitting between 10 and 40 times the allowable limit for harmful pollutants.

Intellectual Property

Individual inventors, universities, and research organizations provide the fundamental research behind many existing and emerging technologies. Every year, the majority of U.S. patents are issued to this group of inventors. Through this fundamental research, these inventors provide a significant competitive advantage to this country. Unfortunately, while responsible for most of the inventions that issue into U.S. patents every year, individual inventors, universities and research organizations receive very little of the licensing revenues for U.S. patents. Large companies reap 99% of all patent licensing revenues.

Robbins Geller enforces the rights of these inventors by filing and litigating patent infringement cases against infringing entities. Our attorneys have decades of patent litigation experience in a variety of technical applications. This experience, combined with the Firm's extensive resources, gives individual inventors the ability to enforce their patent rights against even the largest infringing companies.

Our attorneys have experience handling cases involving a broad range of technologies, including:

- biochemistry
- telecommunications
- medical devices
- medical diagnostics
- networking systems
- computer hardware devices and software
- mechanical devices
- video gaming technologies
- audio and video recording devices

Human Rights, Labor Practices and Public Policy

Robbins Geller attorneys have a long tradition of representing the victims of unfair labor practices and violations of human rights. These include:

- **Does I v. The Gap, Inc.**, No. 01 0031 (D. N. Mar. I.). In this groundbreaking case, Robbins Geller attorneys represented a class of 30,000 garment workers who alleged that they had worked under sweatshop conditions in garment factories in Saipan that produced clothing for top U.S. retailers such as The Gap, Target and J.C. Penney. In the first action of its kind, Robbins Geller attorneys pursued claims against the factories and the retailers alleging violations of RICO, the Alien Tort Claims Act, and the Law of Nations based on the alleged systemic labor and human rights abuses occurring in Saipan. This case was a companion to two other actions: **Does I v. Advance Textile Corp.**, No. 99 0002 (D. N. Mar. I.), which alleged overtime violations by the garment factories under the Fair Labor Standards Act and local labor law, and **UNITE v. The Gap, Inc.**, No. 300474 (Cal. Super. Ct., San Francisco Cty.), which alleged violations of California's Unfair Practices Law by the U.S. retailers. These actions resulted in a settlement of approximately \$20 million that included a comprehensive monitoring program to address past violations by the factories and prevent future ones. The members of the litigation team were honored as Trial Lawyers of the Year by the Trial Lawyers for Public Justice in recognition of the team's efforts at bringing about the precedent-setting settlement of the actions.
- **Liberty Mutual Overtime Cases**, No. JCCP 4234 (Cal. Super. Ct., Los Angeles Cty.). Robbins Geller attorneys served as co-lead counsel on behalf of 1,600 current and former insurance claims adjusters at Liberty Mutual Insurance Company and several of its subsidiaries. Plaintiffs brought the case to recover unpaid overtime compensation and associated penalties, alleging that Liberty Mutual had misclassified its claims adjusters as exempt from overtime under California law. After 13 years of complex and exhaustive litigation, Robbins Geller secured a settlement in which Liberty Mutual agreed to pay \$65 million into a fund to compensate the class of claims adjusters for unpaid overtime. The Liberty Mutual action is one of a few claims adjuster overtime actions brought in California or elsewhere to result in a successful outcome for plaintiffs since 2004.
- **Veliz v. Cintas Corp.**, No. 5:03-cv-01180 (N.D. Cal.). Brought against one of the nation's largest commercial laundries for violations of the Fair Labor Standards Act for misclassifying truck drivers as salesmen to avoid payment of overtime.
- **Kasky v. Nike, Inc.**, 27 Cal. 4th 939 (2002). The California Supreme Court upheld claims that an apparel manufacturer misled the public regarding its exploitative labor practices, thereby violating California statutes prohibiting unfair competition and false advertising. The Court rejected defense contentions that any misconduct was protected by the First Amendment, finding the heightened constitutional protection afforded to noncommercial speech inappropriate in such a circumstance.

Shareholder derivative litigation brought by Robbins Geller attorneys at times also involves stopping anti-union activities, including:

- **Southern Pacific/Overnite**. A shareholder action stemming from several hundred million dollars in loss of value in the company due to systematic violations by Overnite of U.S. labor laws.
- **Massey Energy**. A shareholder action against an anti-union employer for flagrant violations of environmental laws resulting in multi-million-dollar penalties.
- **Crown Petroleum**. A shareholder action against a Texas-based oil company for self-dealing and breach of fiduciary duty while also involved in a union lockout.

Environment and Public Health

Robbins Geller attorneys have also represented plaintiffs in class actions related to environmental law. The Firm's attorneys represented, on a *pro bono* basis, the Sierra Club and the National Economic Development and Law Center as *amici curiae* in a federal suit designed to uphold the federal and state use of project labor agreements ("PLAs"). The suit represented a legal challenge to President Bush's Executive Order 13202, which prohibits the use of project labor agreements on construction projects receiving federal funds. Our *amici* brief in the matter outlined and stressed the significant environmental and socio-economic benefits associated with the use of PLAs on large-scale construction projects.

Attorneys with Robbins Geller have been involved in several other significant environmental cases, including:

- **Public Citizen v. U.S. D.O.T.** Robbins Geller attorneys represented a coalition of labor, environmental, industry and public health organizations including Public Citizen, The International Brotherhood of Teamsters, California AFL-CIO and California Trucking Industry in a challenge to a decision by the Bush administration to lift a Congressionally-imposed "moratorium" on cross-border trucking from Mexico on the basis that such trucks do not conform to emission controls under the Clean Air Act, and further, that the administration did not first complete a comprehensive environmental impact analysis as required by the National Environmental Policy Act. The suit was dismissed by the United States Supreme Court, the Court holding that because the D.O.T. lacked discretion to prevent crossborder trucking, an environmental assessment was not required.
- **Sierra Club v. AK Steel.** Brought on behalf of the Sierra Club for massive emissions of air and water pollution by a steel mill, including homes of workers living in the adjacent communities, in violation of the Federal Clean Air Act, Resource Conservation Recovery Act and the Clean Water Act.
- **MTBE Litigation.** Brought on behalf of various water districts for befouling public drinking water with MTBE, a gasoline additive linked to cancer.
- **Exxon Valdez.** Brought on behalf of fisherman and Alaska residents for billions of dollars in damages resulting from the greatest oil spill in U.S. history.
- **Avila Beach.** A citizens' suit against UNOCAL for leakage from the oil company pipeline so severe it literally destroyed the town of Avila Beach, California.

Federal laws such as the Clean Water Act, the Clean Air Act, and the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act and state laws such as California's Proposition 65 exist to protect the environment and the public from abuses by corporate and government organizations. Companies can be found liable for negligence, trespass or intentional environmental damage, be forced to pay for reparations and to come into compliance with existing laws. Prominent cases litigated by Robbins Geller attorneys include representing more than 4,000 individuals suing for personal injury and property damage related to the Stringfellow Dump Site in Southern California, participation in the Exxon Valdez oil spill litigation, and litigation involving the toxic spill arising from a Southern Pacific train derailment near Dunsmuir, California.

Robbins Geller attorneys have led the fight against Big Tobacco since 1991. As an example, Robbins Geller attorneys filed the case that helped get rid of Joe Camel, representing various public and private plaintiffs, including the State of Arkansas, the general public in California, the cities of San Francisco, Los Angeles and Birmingham, 14 counties in California, and the working men and women of this country in the Union Pension and Welfare Fund cases that have been filed in 40 states. In 1992, Robbins Geller attorneys filed the first case in the country that alleged a conspiracy by the Big Tobacco companies.

Pro Bono

Robbins Geller provides counsel to those unable to afford legal representation as part of a continuous and longstanding commitment to the communities in which it serves. Over the years the Firm has dedicated a considerable amount of time, energy, and a full range of its resources for many pro bono and charitable actions.

Robbins Geller has been honored for its pro bono efforts by the California State Bar (including a nomination for the President's Pro Bono Law Firm of the Year award) and the San Diego Volunteer Lawyer's Program, among others.

Some of the Firm's and its attorneys' pro bono and charitable actions include:

- Representing Trump University students in two class actions against President Donald J. Trump. The historic settlement provides \$25 million to approximately 7,000 consumers. This means individual class members will be eligible for upwards of \$35,000 in restitution – an extraordinary result.
- Representing children diagnosed with Autism Spectrum Disorder, as well as children with significant disabilities, in New York to remedy flawed educational policies and practices that cause substantial harm to these and other similar children year after year.
- Representing 19 San Diego County children diagnosed with Autism Spectrum Disorder in their appeal of the San Diego Regional Center's termination of funding for a crucial therapy. The victory resulted in a complete reinstatement of funding and set a precedent that allows other children to obtain the treatments they need.
- Serving as Northern California and Hawaii District Coordinator for the United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit's Pro Bono program since 1993.
- Representing the Sierra Club and the National Economic Development and Law Center as *amicus curiae* before the U.S. Supreme Court.
- Obtaining political asylum, after an initial application had been denied, for an impoverished Somali family whose ethnic minority faced systematic persecution and genocidal violence in Somalia, as well as forced female mutilation.
- Working with the ACLU in a class action filed on behalf of welfare applicants subject to San Diego County's "Project 100%" program. Relief was had when the County admitted that food-stamp eligibility could not hinge upon the Project 100% "home visits," and again when the district court ruled that unconsented "collateral contacts" violated state regulations. The decision was noted by the *Harvard Law Review*, *The New York Times* and *The Colbert Report*.
- Filing numerous *amicus curiae* briefs on behalf of religious organizations and clergy that support civil rights, oppose government-backed religious-viewpoint discrimination, and uphold the American traditions of religious freedom and church-state separation.
- Serving as *amicus* counsel in a Ninth Circuit appeal from a Board of Immigration Appeals deportation decision. In addition to obtaining a reversal of the BIA's deportation order, the Firm consulted with the Federal Defenders' Office on cases presenting similar fact patterns, which resulted in a precedent-setting *en banc* decision from the Ninth Circuit resolving a question of state and federal law that had been contested and conflicted for decades.

E-Discovery

Robbins Geller has successfully litigated some of the largest and most complex shareholder and antitrust actions in history and has become the vanguard of a rapidly evolving world of e-discovery in complex litigation. The Firm has 200 attorneys supported by a large staff of forensic and e-discovery specialists and has a level of technological sophistication that is unmatched by any other firm. As the size and stakes of complex litigation continue to increase, it is more important than ever to retain counsel with a successful track record of results. Robbins Geller has consistently proven to be the right choice for anyone seeking representation in actions against the largest corporations in the world.

Led by 20-year litigation veteran Tor Gronborg, and advised by Lea Bays, e-discovery counsel, and Christine Milliron, Director of E-Discovery and Litigation Support, the Robbins Geller e-discovery practice group is a multi-disciplinary team of attorneys, forensic analysts and database professionals. No plaintiffs' firm is better equipped to develop the type of comprehensive and case specific e-discovery strategy that is necessary for today's complex litigation. The attorneys have extensive knowledge and experience in drafting and negotiating sophisticated e-discovery protocols, including those involving the use of predictive coding. High quality document review services are performed by a consistent group of staff attorneys who are experienced in the Firm's litigation practice areas and specialize in document review and analysis. A team of forensic and technology professionals work closely with the attorneys to ensure an effective and efficient e-discovery strategy. The litigation support team includes six Relativity Certified Administrators. Collectively, the Robbins Geller forensic and technology professionals have more than 75 years of e-discovery experience.

Members of the practice group are also leaders in shaping the broader dialogue on e-discovery issues. They regularly contribute to industry publications, speak at conferences organized by leading e-discovery think tanks such as The Sedona Conference and Georgetown University Law Center's Advanced eDiscovery Institute, and play prominent roles in the local chapters of Women in eDiscovery and the Relativity Users Steering Committee. The e-discovery practice group also offers regular in-house training and education, ensuring that members of the Firm are always up-to-date on the evolving world of e-discovery law and technology.

Robbins Geller has always been a leader in document-intensive litigation. Boasting high-performing infrastructure resources, state-of-the-art technology, and a deep bench of some of the most highly trained Relativity Certified Administrators and network engineers, the Firm's capabilities rival, if not outshine, those of the top e-discovery vendors in the industry. Additionally, the Firm's implementation of advanced analytic technologies and custom workflows makes its work fast, smart and efficient. Combined with Robbins Geller's decision to manage and host its litigation support in-house, these technologies reduce the Firm's reliance on third-party vendors, enabling it to offer top-notch e-discovery services to clients at a fair and reasonable cost.

Security is a top priority at Robbins Geller. The Firm's hosted e-discovery is secured using bank-level 128 encryption and is protected behind state-of-the-art Cisco firewalls. All e-discovery data is hosted on Firm-owned equipment at an SSAE 16-compliant, SOC 1, 2, and 3 audited facility that features 9.1 megawatts of power, N+1 or better redundancy on all data center systems, and security protocols required by leading businesses in the most stringent verticals. Originally designed to support a large defense contractor, it is built to rigorous standards, complete with redundant power and cooling systems plus multiple generators.

Prominent Cases and Judicial Commendations

Prominent Cases

Robbins Geller attorneys obtained outstanding results in some of the most notorious and well-known cases, frequently earning judicial commendations for the quality of their representation.

- ***In re Enron Corp. Sec. Litig.***, No. H-01-3624 (S.D. Tex.). Investors lost billions of dollars as a result of the massive fraud at Enron. In appointing Robbins Geller lawyers as sole lead counsel to represent the interests of Enron investors, the court found that the Firm's zealous prosecution and level of "insight" set it apart from its peers. Robbins Geller attorneys and lead plaintiff The Regents of the University of California aggressively pursued numerous defendants, including many of Wall Street's biggest banks, and successfully obtained settlements in excess of **\$7.2 billion** for the benefit of investors. ***This is the largest securities class action recovery in history.***

The court overseeing this action had utmost praise for Robbins Geller's efforts and stated that "[t]he experience, ability, and reputation of the attorneys of [Robbins Geller] is not disputed; it is one of the most successful law firms in securities class actions, if not the preeminent one, in the country." *In re Enron Corp. Sec., Derivative & "ERISA" Litig.*, 586 F. Supp. 2d 732, 797 (S.D. Tex. 2008).

The court further commented: "[I]n the face of extraordinary obstacles, the skills, expertise, commitment, and tenacity of [Robbins Geller] in this litigation cannot be overstated. Not to be overlooked are the unparalleled results, . . . which demonstrate counsel's clearly superlative litigating and negotiating skills." *Id.* at 789.

The court stated that the Firm's attorneys "are to be commended for their zealousness, their diligence, their perseverance, their creativity, the enormous breadth and depth of their investigations and analysis, and their expertise in all areas of securities law on behalf of the proposed class." *Id.*

In addition, the court noted, "This Court considers [Robbins Geller] 'a lion' at the securities bar on the national level," noting that the Lead Plaintiff selected Robbins Geller because of the Firm's "outstanding reputation, experience, and success in securities litigation nationwide." *Id.* at 790.

The court further stated that "Lead Counsel's fearsome reputation and successful track record undoubtedly were substantial factors in . . . obtaining these recoveries." *Id.*

Finally, Judge Harmon stated: "As this Court has explained [this is] an extraordinary group of attorneys who achieved the largest settlement fund ever despite the great odds against them." *Id.* at 828.

- ***Jaffe v. Household Int'l, Inc.***, No. 02-C-05893 (N.D. Ill.). As sole lead counsel, Robbins Geller obtained a record-breaking settlement of **\$1.575 billion** after 14 years of litigation, including a six-week jury trial in 2009 that resulted in a securities fraud verdict in favor of the class. In 2015, the Seventh Circuit Court of Appeals upheld the jury's verdict that defendants made false or misleading statements of material fact about the company's business practices and financial results, but remanded the case for a new trial on the issue of whether the individual defendants "made" certain false statements, whether those false statements caused plaintiffs' losses, and the amount of damages. The parties reached an agreement to settle the case just hours before the retrial was scheduled to begin on June 6, 2016. ***The \$1.575 billion settlement, approved in October 2016, is the largest ever following a securities fraud class action trial, the largest securities fraud settlement in the Seventh Circuit and the seventh-largest settlement ever in a post-PSLRA securities***

fraud case. According to published reports, the case was just the seventh securities fraud case tried to a verdict since the passage of the PSLRA.

In approving the settlement, the Honorable Jorge L. Alonso noted the team's "skill and determination" while recognizing that "Lead Counsel prosecuted the case vigorously and skillfully over 14 years against nine of the country's most prominent law firms" and "achieved an exceptionally significant recovery for the class." The court added that the team faced "significant hurdles" and "uphill battles" throughout the case and recognized that "[c]lass counsel performed a very high-quality legal work in the context of a thorny case in which the state of the law has been and is in flux." The court succinctly concluded that the settlement was "a spectacular result for the class." *Jaffe v. Household Int'l, Inc.*, No. 02-C-5892, 2016 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 156921, at *8 (N.D. Ill. Nov. 10, 2016); *Jaffe v. Household Int'l, Inc.*, No. 02-C-05893, Transcript at 56, 65 (N.D. Ill. Oct. 20, 2016).

- ***Hall v. NCAA (Restricted Earnings Coach Antitrust Litigation)***, No. 94-2392 (D. Kan.). Robbins Geller attorneys were lead counsel and lead trial counsel for one of three classes of coaches in these consolidated price-fixing actions against the National Collegiate Athletic Association. On May 4, 1998, the jury returned verdicts in favor of the three classes for more than \$70 million.
- ***In re UnitedHealth Grp. Inc. PSLRA Litig.***, No. 06-CV-1691 (D. Minn.). In the *UnitedHealth* case, Robbins Geller represented the California Public Employees' Retirement System ("CalPERS") and demonstrated its willingness to vigorously advocate for its institutional clients, even under the most difficult circumstances. For example, in 2006, the issue of high-level executives backdating stock options made national headlines. During that time, many law firms, including Robbins Geller, brought shareholder derivative lawsuits against the companies' boards of directors for breaches of their fiduciary duties or for improperly granting backdated options. Rather than pursuing a shareholder derivative case, the Firm filed a securities fraud class action against the company on behalf of CalPERS. In doing so, Robbins Geller faced significant and unprecedented legal obstacles with respect to loss causation, *i.e.*, that defendants' actions were responsible for causing the stock losses. Despite these legal hurdles, Robbins Geller obtained an \$895 million recovery on behalf of the UnitedHealth shareholders. Shortly after reaching the \$895 million settlement with UnitedHealth, the remaining corporate defendants, including former CEO William A. McGuire, also settled. McGuire paid \$30 million and returned stock options representing more than three million shares to the shareholders. The total recovery for the class was over \$925 million, the largest stock option backdating recovery ever, and ***a recovery that is more than four times larger than the next largest options backdating recovery***. Moreover, Robbins Geller obtained unprecedented corporate governance reforms, including election of a shareholder-nominated member to the company's board of directors, a mandatory holding period for shares acquired by executives via option exercise, and executive compensation reforms that tie pay to performance.
- ***Alaska Elec. Pension Fund v. CitiGroup, Inc. (In re WorldCom Sec. Litig.)***, No. 03 Civ. 8269 (S.D.N.Y.). Robbins Geller attorneys represented more than 50 private and public institutions that opted out of the class action case and sued WorldCom's bankers, officers and directors, and auditors in courts around the country for losses related to WorldCom bond offerings from 1998 to 2001. The Firm's clients included major public institutions from across the country such as CalPERS, CalSTRS, the state pension funds of Maine, Illinois, New Mexico and West Virginia, union pension funds, and private entities such as AIG and Northwestern Mutual. Robbins Geller attorneys recovered more than \$650 million for their clients, substantially more than they would have recovered as part of the class.
- ***Luther v. Countrywide Fin. Corp.***, No. 12-cv-05125 (C.D. Cal.). Robbins Geller attorneys secured a \$500 million settlement for institutional and individual investors in what is the largest RMBS purchaser class action settlement in history, and one of the largest class action securities settlements of all time. The unprecedented settlement resolves claims against Countrywide and Wall Street banks

that issued the securities. The action was the first securities class action case filed against originators and Wall Street banks as a result of the credit crisis. As co-lead counsel Robbins Geller forged through six years of hard-fought litigation, oftentimes litigating issues of first impression, in order to secure the landmark settlement for its clients and the class.

In approving the settlement, Judge Mariana R. Pfaelzer repeatedly complimented plaintiffs' attorneys, noting that it was "beyond serious dispute that Class Counsel has vigorously prosecuted the Settlement Actions on both the state and federal level over the last six years." Judge Pfaelzer also commented that "[w]ithout a settlement, these cases would continue indefinitely, resulting in significant risks to recovery and continued litigation costs. It is difficult to underestimate the risks to recovery if litigation had continued." *Me. State Ret. Sys. v. Countrywide Fin. Corp.*, No. 2:10-CV-00302, 2013 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 179190, at *44, *56 (C.D. Cal. Dec. 5, 2013).

Judge Pfaelzer further noted that the proposed \$500 million settlement represents one of the "largest MBS class action settlements to date. Indeed, this settlement easily surpasses the next largest . . . MBS settlement." *Id.* at *59.

- ***In re Wachovia Preferred Sec. & Bond/Notes Litig.***, No. 09-cv-06351 (S.D.N.Y.). In litigation over bonds and preferred securities, issued by Wachovia between 2006 and 2008, Robbins Geller and co-counsel obtained a significant settlement with Wachovia successor Wells Fargo & Company (\$590 million) and Wachovia auditor KPMG LLP (\$37 million). ***The total settlement – \$627 million – is one of the largest credit-crisis settlements involving Securities Act claims and one of the 20 largest securities class action recoveries in history.*** The settlement is also one of the biggest securities class action recoveries arising from the credit crisis.

As alleged in the complaint, the offering materials for the bonds and preferred securities misstated and failed to disclose the true nature and quality of Wachovia's mortgage loan portfolio, which exposed the bank and misled investors to tens of billions of dollars in losses on mortgage-related assets. In reality, Wachovia employed high-risk underwriting standards and made loans to subprime borrowers, contrary to the offering materials and their statements of "pristine credit quality." Robbins Geller served as co-lead counsel representing the City of Livonia Employees' Retirement System, Hawaii Sheet Metal Workers Pension Fund, and the investor class.

- ***In re Cardinal Health, Inc. Sec. Litig.***, No. C2-04-575 (S.D. Ohio). As sole lead counsel representing Cardinal Health shareholders, Robbins Geller obtained a recovery of \$600 million for investors. On behalf of the lead plaintiffs, Amalgamated Bank, the New Mexico State Investment Council, and the California Ironworkers Field Trust Fund, the Firm aggressively pursued class claims and won notable courtroom victories, including a favorable decision on defendants' motion to dismiss. *In re Cardinal Health, Inc. Sec. Litigs.*, 426 F. Supp. 2d 688 (S.D. Ohio 2006). At the time, the \$600 million settlement was the tenth-largest settlement in the history of securities fraud litigation and is the largest-ever recovery in a securities fraud action in the Sixth Circuit. Judge Marbley commented:

The quality of representation in this case was superb. Lead Counsel, [Robbins Geller], are nationally recognized leaders in complex securities litigation class actions. The quality of the representation is demonstrated by the substantial benefit achieved for the Class and the efficient, effective prosecution and resolution of this action. Lead Counsel defeated a volley of motions to dismiss, thwarting well-formed challenges from prominent and capable attorneys from six different law firms.

In re Cardinal Health Inc. Sec. Litigs., 528 F. Supp. 2d 752, 768 (S.D. Ohio 2007).

- **AOL Time Warner Cases I & II**, JCCP Nos. 4322 & 4325 (Cal. Super. Ct., Los Angeles Cty.). Robbins Geller represented The Regents of the University of California, six Ohio state pension funds, Rabo Bank (NL), the Scottish Widows Investment Partnership, several Australian public and private funds, insurance companies, and numerous additional institutional investors, both domestic and international, in state and federal court opt-out litigation stemming from Time Warner's disastrous 2001 merger with Internet high flier America Online. Robbins Geller attorneys exposed a massive and sophisticated accounting fraud involving America Online's e-commerce and advertising revenue. After almost four years of litigation involving extensive discovery, the Firm secured combined settlements for its opt-out clients totaling over \$629 million just weeks before The Regents' case pending in California state court was scheduled to go to trial. The Regents' gross recovery of \$246 million is the largest individual opt-out securities recovery in history.
- **Abu Dhabi Commercial Bank v. Morgan Stanley & Co.**, No. 1:08-cv-07508-SAS-DCF (S.D.N.Y.), and **King County, Washington v. IKB Deutsche Industriebank AG**, No. 1:09-cv-08387-SAS (S.D.N.Y.). The Firm represented multiple institutional investors in successfully pursuing recoveries from two failed structured investment vehicles, each of which had been rated "AAA" by Standard & Poors and Moody's, but which failed fantastically in 2007. The matter settled just prior to trial in 2013. This result was only made possible after Robbins Geller lawyers beat back the rating agencies' longtime argument that ratings were opinions protected by the First Amendment.
- **In re HealthSouth Corp. Sec. Litig.**, No. CV-03-BE-1500-S (N.D. Ala.). As court-appointed co-lead counsel, Robbins Geller attorneys obtained a combined recovery of \$671 million from HealthSouth, its auditor Ernst & Young, and its investment banker, UBS, for the benefit of stockholder plaintiffs. The settlement against HealthSouth represents one of the larger settlements in securities class action history and is considered among the top 15 settlements achieved after passage of the PSLRA. Likewise, the settlement against Ernst & Young is one of the largest securities class action settlements entered into by an accounting firm since the passage of the PSLRA. HealthSouth and its financial advisors perpetrated one of the largest and most pervasive frauds in the history of U.S. healthcare, prompting Congressional and law enforcement inquiry and resulting in guilty pleas of 16 former HealthSouth executives in related federal criminal prosecutions. In March 2009, Judge Karon Bowdre commented in the *HealthSouth* class certification opinion: "The court has had many opportunities since November 2001 to examine the work of class counsel and the supervision by the Class Representatives. The court finds both to be far more than adequate." *In re HealthSouth Corp. Sec. Litig.*, 257 F.R.D. 260, 275 (N.D. Ala. 2009).
- **In re Dynegy Inc. Sec. Litig.**, No. H-02-1571 (S.D. Tex.). As sole lead counsel representing The Regents of the University of California and the class of Dynegy investors, Robbins Geller attorneys obtained a combined settlement of \$474 million from Dynegy, Citigroup, Inc. and Arthur Andersen LLP for their involvement in a clandestine financing scheme known as Project Alpha. Given Dynegy's limited ability to pay, Robbins Geller attorneys structured a settlement (reached shortly before the commencement of trial) that maximized plaintiffs' recovery without bankrupting the company. Most notably, the settlement agreement provides that Dynegy will appoint two board members to be nominated by The Regents, which Robbins Geller and The Regents believe will benefit all of Dynegy's stockholders.
- **Jones v. Pfizer Inc.**, No. 1:10-cv-03864 (S.D.N.Y.). Lead plaintiff Stichting Philips Pensioenfonds obtained a \$400 million settlement on behalf of class members who purchased Pfizer Inc. common stock during the January 19, 2006 to January 23, 2009 class period. The settlement against Pfizer resolves accusations that it misled investors about an alleged off-label drug marketing scheme. As sole lead counsel, Robbins Geller attorneys helped achieve this exceptional result after five years of hard-fought litigation against the toughest and the brightest members of the securities defense bar by litigating this case all the way to trial.

In approving the settlement, United States District Judge Alvin K. Hellerstein commended the Firm, noting that “[w]ithout the quality and the toughness that you have exhibited, our society would not be as good as it is with all its problems. So from me to you is a vote of thanks for devoting yourself to this work and doing it well. . . . You did a really good job. Congratulations.”

- ***In re Qwest Commc'ns Int'l, Inc. Sec. Litig.***, No. 01-cv-1451 (D. Colo.). Robbins Geller attorneys served as lead counsel for a class of investors that purchased Qwest securities. In July 2001, the Firm filed the initial complaint in this action on behalf of its clients, long before any investigation into Qwest's financial statements was initiated by the SEC or Department of Justice. After five years of litigation, lead plaintiffs entered into a settlement with Qwest and certain individual defendants that provided a \$400 million recovery for the class and created a mechanism that allowed the vast majority of class members to share in an additional \$250 million recovered by the SEC. In 2008, Robbins Geller attorneys recovered an additional \$45 million for the class in a settlement with defendants Joseph P. Nacchio and Robert S. Woodruff, the CEO and CFO, respectively, of Qwest during large portions of the class period.
- ***Fort Worth Emps.' Ret. Fund v. J.P. Morgan Chase & Co.***, No. 1:09-cv-03701 (S.D.N.Y.).
Robbins Geller attorneys served as lead counsel for a class of investors and obtained court approval of a \$388 million recovery in nine 2007 residential mortgage-backed securities offerings issued by J.P. Morgan. The settlement represents, on a percentage basis, the largest recovery ever achieved in an MBS purchaser class action. The result was achieved after more than five years of hard-fought litigation and an extensive investigation. In granting approval of the settlement, the court stated the following about Robbins Geller attorneys litigating the case: “[T]here is no question in my mind that this is a very good result for the class and that the plaintiffs' counsel fought the case very hard with extensive discovery, a lot of depositions, several rounds of briefing of various legal issues going all the way through class certification.”- ***NECA-IBEW Health & Welfare Fund v. Goldman Sachs & Co.***, No. 1:08-cv-10783 (S.D.N.Y.).
As sole lead counsel, Robbins Geller obtained a \$272 million settlement on behalf of Goldman Sachs' shareholders. The settlement concludes one of the last remaining mortgage-backed securities purchaser class actions arising out of the global financial crisis. The remarkable result was achieved following seven years of extensive litigation. After the claims were dismissed in 2010, Robbins Geller secured a landmark victory from the Second Circuit Court of Appeals that clarified the scope of permissible class actions asserting claims under the Securities Act of 1933 on behalf of MBS investors. Specifically, the Second Circuit's decision rejected the concept of “tranche” standing and concluded that a lead plaintiff in an MBS class action has class standing to pursue claims on behalf of purchasers of other securities that were issued from the same registration statement and backed by pools of mortgages originated by the same lenders who had originated mortgages backing the lead plaintiff's securities.

In approving the settlement, the Honorable Loretta A. Preska of the Southern District of New York complimented Robbins Geller attorneys, noting:

Counsel, thank you for your papers. They were, by the way, extraordinary papers in support of the settlement, and I will particularly note Professor Miller's declaration in which he details the procedural aspects of the case and then speaks of plaintiffs' counsel's success in the Second Circuit essentially changing the law.

I will also note what counsel have said, and that is that this case illustrates the proper functioning of the statute.

* * *

Counsel, you can all be proud of what you've done for your clients. You've done an extraordinarily good job.

NECA-IBEW Health & Welfare Fund v. Goldman Sachs & Co., No. 1:08-cv-10783, Transcript at 10-11 (S.D.N.Y. May 2, 2016).

- ***Schuh v. HCA Holdings, Inc.***, No. 3:11-cv-01033 (M.D. Tenn.). As sole lead counsel, Robbins Geller obtained a groundbreaking \$215 million settlement for former HCA Holdings, Inc. shareholders – the largest securities class action recovery ever in Tennessee. Reached shortly before trial was scheduled to commence, the settlement resolves claims that the Registration Statement and Prospectus HCA filed in connection with the company's massive \$4.3 billion 2011 IPO contained material misstatements and omissions. The recovery achieved approximately 70% of classwide damages, which as a percentage of damages significantly exceeds the median class action recovery of 2%-3% of damages. At the hearing on final approval of the settlement, the Honorable Kevin H. Sharp described Robbins Geller attorneys as "gladiators" and commented: "Looking at the benefit obtained, the effort that you had to put into it, [and] the complexity in this case . . . I appreciate the work that you all have done on this." *Schuh v. HCA Holdings, Inc.*, No. 3:11-CV-01033, Transcript at 12-13 (M.D. Tenn. Apr. 11, 2016).
- ***Silverman v. Motorola, Inc.***, No. 1:07-cv-04507 (N.D. Ill.). The Firm served as lead counsel on behalf of a class of investors in Motorola, Inc., ultimately recovering \$200 million for investors just two months before the case was set for trial. This outstanding result was obtained despite the lack of an SEC investigation or any financial restatement. In May 2012, the Honorable Amy J. St. Eve of the Northern District of Illinois commented: "The representation that [Robbins Geller] provided to the class was significant, both in terms of quality and quantity." *Silverman v. Motorola, Inc.*, No. 07 C 4507, 2012 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 63477, at *11 (N.D. Ill. May 7, 2012), aff'd, 739 F.3d 956 (7th Cir. 2013).

In affirming the district court's award of attorneys' fees, the Seventh Circuit noted that "no other law firm was willing to serve as lead counsel. Lack of competition not only implies a higher fee but also suggests that most members of the securities bar saw this litigation as too risky for their practices." *Silverman v. Motorola Sols., Inc.*, 739 F.3d 956, 958 (7th Cir. 2013).

- ***In re AT&T Corp. Sec. Litig.***, MDL No. 1399 (D.N.J.). Robbins Geller attorneys served as lead counsel for a class of investors that purchased AT&T common stock. The case charged defendants AT&T and its former Chairman and CEO, C. Michael Armstrong, with violations of the federal securities laws in connection with AT&T's April 2000 initial public offering of its wireless tracking stock, the largest IPO in American history. After two weeks of trial, and on the eve of scheduled testimony by Armstrong and infamous telecom analyst Jack Grubman, defendants agreed to settle the case for \$100 million. In granting approval of the settlement, the court stated the following about the Robbins Geller attorneys handling the case:

Lead Counsel are highly skilled attorneys with great experience in prosecuting complex securities action[s], and their professionalism and diligence displayed during [this] litigation substantiates this characterization. The Court notes that Lead Counsel displayed excellent lawyering skills through their consistent preparedness during court proceedings, arguments and the trial, and their well-written and thoroughly researched submissions to the Court. Undoubtedly, the attentive and persistent effort of Lead Counsel was integral in achieving the excellent result for the Class.

In re AT&T Corp. Sec. Litig., MDL No. 1399, 2005 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 46144, at *28-*29 (D.N.J. Apr. 25, 2005), *aff'd*, 455 F.3d 160 (3d Cir. 2006).

- ***In re Dollar Gen. Corp. Sec. Litig.***, No. 01-CV-00388 (M.D. Tenn.). Robbins Geller attorneys served as lead counsel in this case in which the Firm recovered \$172.5 million for investors. The *Dollar General* settlement was the largest shareholder class action recovery ever in Tennessee.
- ***Carpenters Health & Welfare Fund v. Coca-Cola Co.***, No. 00-CV-2838 (N.D. Ga.). As co-lead counsel representing Coca-Cola shareholders, Robbins Geller attorneys obtained a recovery of \$137.5 million after nearly eight years of litigation. Robbins Geller attorneys traveled to three continents to uncover the evidence that ultimately resulted in the settlement of this hard-fought litigation. The case concerned Coca-Cola's shipping of excess concentrate at the end of financial reporting periods for the sole purpose of meeting analyst earnings expectations, as well as the company's failure to properly account for certain impaired foreign bottling assets.
- ***Schwartz v. TXU Corp.***, No. 02-CV-2243 (N.D. Tex.). As co-lead counsel, Robbins Geller attorneys obtained a recovery of over \$149 million for a class of purchasers of TXU securities. The recovery compensated class members for damages they incurred as a result of their purchases of TXU securities at inflated prices. Defendants had inflated the price of these securities by concealing the fact that TXU's operating earnings were declining due to a deteriorating gas pipeline and the failure of the company's European operations.
- ***In re Doral Fin. Corp. Sec. Litig.***, 05 MDL No. 1706 (S.D.N.Y.). In July 2007, the Honorable Richard Owen of the Southern District of New York approved the \$129 million settlement, finding in his order:

The services provided by Lead Counsel [Robbins Geller] were efficient and highly successful, resulting in an outstanding recovery for the Class without the substantial expense, risk and delay of continued litigation. Such efficiency and effectiveness supports the requested fee percentage.

Cases brought under the federal securities laws are notably difficult and notoriously uncertain. . . . Despite the novelty and difficulty of the issues raised, Lead Plaintiffs' counsel secured an excellent result for the Class.

. . . Based upon Lead Plaintiff's counsel's diligent efforts on behalf of the Class, as well as their skill and reputations, Lead Plaintiff's counsel were able to negotiate a very favorable result for the Class. . . . The ability of [Robbins Geller] to obtain such a favorable partial settlement for the Class in the face of such formidable opposition confirms the superior quality of their representation

In re Doral Fin. Corp. Sec. Litig., No. 1:05-md-01706, Order at 4-5 (S.D.N.Y. July 17, 2007).

- ***In re Exxon Valdez***, No. A89 095 Civ. (D. Alaska), and ***In re Exxon Valdez Oil Spill Litig.***, No. 3 AN 89 2533 (Alaska Super. Ct., 3d Jud. Dist.). Robbins Geller attorneys served on the Plaintiffs' Coordinating Committee and Plaintiffs' Law Committee in this massive litigation resulting from the Exxon Valdez oil spill in Alaska in March 1989. The jury awarded hundreds of millions in compensatory damages, as well as \$5 billion in punitive damages (the latter were later reduced by the U.S. Supreme Court to \$507 million).
- ***Mangini v. R.J. Reynolds Tobacco Co.***, No. 939359 (Cal. Super. Ct., San Francisco Cty.). In this case, R.J. Reynolds admitted that "the *Mangini* action, and the way that it was vigorously litigated, was

an early, significant and unique driver of the overall legal and social controversy regarding underage smoking that led to the decision to phase out the Joe Camel Campaign.”

- **Does I v. The Gap, Inc.**, No. 01 0031 (D. N. Mar. I.). In this groundbreaking case, Robbins Geller attorneys represented a class of 30,000 garment workers who alleged that they had worked under sweatshop conditions in garment factories in Saipan that produced clothing for top U.S. retailers such as The Gap, Target and J.C. Penney. In the first action of its kind, Robbins Geller attorneys pursued claims against the factories and the retailers alleging violations of RICO, the Alien Tort Claims Act, and the Law of Nations based on the alleged systemic labor and human rights abuses occurring in Saipan. This case was a companion to two other actions: **Does I v. Advance Textile Corp.**, No. 99 0002 (D. N. Mar. I.), which alleged overtime violations by the garment factories under the Fair Labor Standards Act and local labor law, and **UNITE v. The Gap, Inc.**, No. 300474 (Cal. Super. Ct., San Francisco Cty.), which alleged violations of California’s Unfair Practices Law by the U.S. retailers. These actions resulted in a settlement of approximately \$20 million that included a comprehensive monitoring program to address past violations by the factories and prevent future ones. The members of the litigation team were honored as Trial Lawyers of the Year by the Trial Lawyers for Public Justice in recognition of the team’s efforts in bringing about the precedent-setting settlement of the actions.
- **In re Prison Realty Sec. Litig.**, No. 3:99-0452 (M.D. Tenn.). Robbins Geller attorneys served as lead counsel for the class, obtaining a \$105 million recovery.
- **In re Honeywell Int’l, Inc. Sec. Litig.**, No. 00-cv-03605 (D.N.J.). Robbins Geller attorneys served as lead counsel for a class of investors that purchased Honeywell common stock. The case charged Honeywell and its top officers with violations of the federal securities laws, alleging the defendants made false public statements concerning Honeywell’s merger with Allied Signal, Inc. and that defendants falsified Honeywell’s financial statements. After extensive discovery, Robbins Geller attorneys obtained a \$100 million settlement for the class.
- **Schwartz v. Visa Int’l**, No. 822404-4 (Cal. Super. Ct., Alameda Cty.). After years of litigation and a six-month trial, Robbins Geller attorneys won one of the largest consumer protection verdicts ever awarded in the United States. Robbins Geller attorneys represented California consumers in an action against Visa and MasterCard for intentionally imposing and concealing a fee from their cardholders. The court ordered Visa and MasterCard to return \$800 million in cardholder losses, which represented 100% of the amount illegally taken, plus 2% interest. In addition, the court ordered full disclosure of the hidden fee.
- **Thompson v. Metro. Life Ins. Co.**, No. 00-cv-5071 (S.D.N.Y.). Robbins Geller attorneys served as lead counsel and obtained \$145 million for the class in a settlement involving racial discrimination claims in the sale of life insurance.
- **In re Prudential Ins. Co. of Am. Sales Practices Litig.**, MDL No. 1061 (D.N.J.). In one of the first cases of its kind, Robbins Geller attorneys obtained a settlement of \$4 billion for deceptive sales practices in connection with the sale of life insurance involving the “vanishing premium” sales scheme.

Additional Judicial Commendations

Robbins Geller attorneys have been praised by countless judges all over the country for the quality of their representation in class-action lawsuits. In addition to the judicial commendations set forth in the Prominent Cases and Precedent-Setting Decisions sections, judges have acknowledged the successful results of the Firm and its attorneys with the following plaudits:

- On March 31, 2017, in granting final approval of the settlement, the Honorable Gonzalo P. Curiel hailed the settlement as “extraordinary” and “all the more exceptional when viewed in light of the risk” of continued litigation. The court further commended Robbins Geller for prosecuting the case on a *pro bono* basis: “Class Counsel’s exceptional decision to provide nearly seven years of legal services to Class Members on a *pro bono* basis evidences not only a lack of collusion, but also that Class Counsel are in fact representing the best interests of Plaintiffs and the Class Members in this Settlement. Instead of seeking compensation for fees and costs that they would otherwise be entitled to, Class Counsel have acted to allow maximum recovery to Plaintiffs and Class Members. Indeed, that Eligible Class Members may receive recovery of 90% or greater is a testament to Class Counsel’s representation and dedication to act in their clients’ best interest.” In addition, at the final approval hearing, the court commented that “this is a case that has been litigated – if not fiercely, zealously throughout.” *Low v. Trump Univ., LLC*, No. 3:10-cv-00940-GPC-WVG, 2017 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 49739, at *14-*15, *40-*41 (S.D. Cal. Mar. 31, 2017); *Low v. Trump University LLC and Donald J. Trump*, No. 10-cv-0940 GPC-WVG, and *Cohen v. Donald J. Trump*, No. 13-cv-2519-GPC-WVG, Transcript at 7 (S.D. Cal. Mar. 30, 2017).
- In January 2017, at the final approval hearing, the Honorable Kevin H. Sharp of the Middle District of Tennessee commended Robbins Geller attorneys, stating: “It was complicated, it was drawn out, and a lot of work clearly went into this [case] I think there is some benefit to the shareholders that are above and beyond money, a benefit to the company above and beyond money that changed hands.” *In re Community Health Sys., Inc. S’holder Derivative Litig.*, No. 3:11-cv-00489, Transcript at 10 (M.D. Tenn. Jan. 17, 2017).
- In November 2016, at the final approval hearing, the Honorable James G. Carr stated: “I kept throwing the case out, and you kept coming back. . . . And it’s both remarkable and noteworthy and a credit to you and your firm that you did so. . . . [Y]ou persuaded the Sixth Circuit. As we know, that’s no mean feat at all.” Judge Carr further complimented the Firm, noting that it “goes without question or even saying” that Robbins Geller is very well-known nationally and that the settlement is an excellent result for the class. He succinctly concluded that “given the tenacity and the time and the effort that [Robbins Geller] lawyers put into [the case]” makes the class “a lot better off.” *Plumbers & Pipefitters Nat'l Pension Fund v. Burns*, No. 3:05-cv-07393-JGC, Transcript at 4, 10, 14, 17 (N.D. Ohio Nov. 18, 2016).
- In September 2016, in granting final approval of the settlement, Judge Arleo commended the “vigorous and skilled efforts” of Robbins Geller attorneys for obtaining “an excellent recovery.” Judge Arleo added that the settlement was reached after “contentious, hard-fought litigation” that ended with “a very, very good result for the class” in a “risky case.” *City of Sterling Heights Gen. Emps.’ Ret. Sys. v. Prudential Fin., Inc.*, No. 2:12-cv-05275-MCA-LDW, Transcript of Hearing at 18-20 (D.N.J. Sept. 28, 2016).
- In August 2015, at the final approval hearing for the settlement, the Honorable Karen M. Humphreys praised Robbins Geller’s “extraordinary efforts” and “excellent lawyering,” noting that the settlement “really does signal that the best is yet to come for your clients and for your prodigious labor as professionals. . . . I wish more citizens in our country could have an appreciation of what this [settlement] truly represents.” *Bennett v. Sprint Nextel Corp.*, No. 2:09-cv-02122-EFM-KMH, Transcript at 8, 25 (D. Kan. Aug. 12, 2015).
- In August 2015, the Honorable Judge Max O. Cogburn, Jr. noted that “plaintiffs’ attorneys were able [to] achieve the big success early” in the case and obtained an “excellent result.” The “extraordinary” settlement was because of “good lawyers . . . doing their good work.” *Nieman v. Duke Energy Corp.*, No. 3:12-cv-456, Transcript at 21, 23, 30 (W.D.N.C. Aug. 12, 2015).

- In July 2015, in approving the settlement, the Honorable Douglas L. Rayes of the District of Arizona stated: “Settlement of the case during pendency of appeal for more than an insignificant amount is rare. The settlement here is substantial and provides favorable recovery for the settlement class under these circumstances.” He continued, noting, “[a]s against the objective measures of . . . settlements [in] other similar cases, [the recovery] is on the high end.” *Teamsters Local 617 Pension & Welfare Funds v. Apollo Grp., Inc.*, No. 2:06-cv-02674-DLR, Transcript at 8, 11 (D. Ariz. July 28, 2015).
- In June 2015, at the conclusion of the hearing for final approval of the settlement, the Honorable Susan Richard Nelson of the District of Minnesota noted that it was “a pleasure to be able to preside over a case like this,” praising Robbins Geller in achieving “an outstanding [result] for [its] clients,” as she was “very impressed with the work done on th[e] case.” *In re St. Jude Med., Inc. Sec. Litig.*, No. 0:10-cv-00851-SRN-TNL, Transcript at 7 (D. Minn. June 12, 2015).
- In May 2015, at the fairness hearing on the settlement, the Honorable William G. Young noted that the case was “very well litigated” by Robbins Geller attorneys, adding that “I don’t just say that as a matter of form. . . . I thank you for the vigorous litigation that I’ve been permitted to be a part of.” *Courtney v. Avid Tech., Inc.*, No. 1:13-cv-10686-WGY, Transcript at 8-9 (D. Mass. May 12, 2015).
- In January 2015, the Honorable William J. Haynes, Jr. of the Middle District of Tennessee described the settlement as a “highly favorable result achieved for the Class” through Robbins Geller’s “diligent prosecution . . . [and] quality of legal services.” The settlement represents the third largest securities recovery ever in the Middle District of Tennessee and the largest in more than a decade. *Garden City Emps.’ Ret. Sys. v. Psychiatric Sols., Inc.*, No. 3:09-cv-00882, 2015 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 181943, at *6-*7 (M.D. Tenn. Jan. 16, 2015).
- In September 2014, in approving the settlement for shareholders, Vice Chancellor John W. Noble noted “[t]he litigation caused a substantial benefit for the class. It is unusual to see a \$29 million recovery.” Vice Chancellor Noble characterized the litigation as “novel” and “not easy,” but “[t]he lawyers took a case and made something of it.” The Court commended Robbins Geller’s efforts in obtaining this result: “The standing and ability of counsel cannot be questioned” and “the benefits achieved by plaintiffs’ counsel in this case cannot be ignored.” *In re Gardner Denver, Inc. S’holder Litig.*, No. 8505-VCN, Transcript at 26-28 (Del. Ch. Sept. 3, 2014).
- In May 2014, at the conclusion of the hearing for final approval of the settlement, the Honorable Elihu M. Berle stated: “I would finally like to congratulate counsel on their efforts to resolve this case, on excellent work – it was the best interest of the class – and to the exhibition of professionalism. So I do thank you for all your efforts.” *Liberty Mutual Overtime Cases*, No. JCCP 4234, Transcript at 20:1-5 (Cal. Super. Ct., Los Angeles Cty. May 29, 2014).
- In March 2014, Ninth Circuit Judge J. Clifford Wallace (presiding) expressed the gratitude of the court: “Thank you. I want to especially thank counsel for this argument. This is a very complicated case and I think we were assisted no matter how we come out by competent counsel coming well prepared. . . . It was a model of the type of an exercise that we appreciate. Thank you very much for your work . . . you were of service to the court.” *Eclectic Properties East, LLC v. The Marcus & Millichap Co.*, No. 12-16526, Transcript (9th Cir. Mar. 14, 2014).
- In February 2014, in approving a settlement, Judge Edward M. Chen noted the “very substantial risks” in the case and recognized Robbins Geller had performed “extensive work on the case.” *In re VeriFone Holdings, Inc. Sec. Litig.*, No. C-07-6140, 2014 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 20044, at *5, *11-*12 (N.D. Cal. Feb. 18, 2014).

- In August 2013, in granting final approval of the settlement, the Honorable Richard J. Sullivan stated: “Lead Counsel is to be commended for this result: it expended considerable effort and resources over the course of the action researching, investigating, and prosecuting the claims, at significant risk to itself, and in a skillful and efficient manner, to achieve an outstanding recovery for class members. Indeed, the result – and the class’s embrace of it – is a testament to the experience and tenacity Lead Counsel brought to bear.” *City of Livonia Emps. Ret. Sys. v. Wyeth*, No. 07 Civ. 10329, 2013 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 113658, at *13 (S.D.N.Y. Aug. 7, 2013).
- In July 2013, in granting final approval of the settlement, the Honorable William H. Alsup stated that Robbins Geller did “excellent work in this case,” and continued, “I look forward to seeing you on the next case.” *Fraser v. Asus Comput. Int’l*, No. C 12-0652, Transcript at 12:2-3 (N.D. Cal. July 11, 2013).
- In June 2013, in certifying the class, U.S. District Judge James G. Carr recognized Robbins Geller’s steadfast commitment to the class, noting that “plaintiffs, with the help of Robbins Geller, have twice successfully appealed this court’s orders granting defendants’ motion to dismiss.” *Plumbers & Pipefitters Nat’l Pension Fund v. Burns*, 292 F.R.D. 515, 524 (N.D. Ohio 2013).
- In November 2012, in granting appointment of lead plaintiff, Chief Judge James F. Holderman commended Robbins Geller for its “substantial experience in securities class action litigation” and commented that the Firm “is recognized as ‘one of the most successful law firms in securities class actions, if not the preeminent one, in the country.’” *In re Enron Corp. Sec.*, 586 F. Supp. 2d 732, 797 (S.D. Tex. 2008) (Harmon, J.).” He continued further that, “‘Robbins Geller attorneys are responsible for obtaining the largest securities fraud class action recovery ever [\$7.2 billion in *Enron*], as well as the largest recoveries in the Fifth, Sixth, Eighth, Tenth and Eleventh Circuits.’” *Bristol Cty. Ret. Sys. v. Allscripts Healthcare Sols., Inc.*, No. 12 C 3297, 2012 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 161441 at *21 (N.D. Ill. Nov. 9, 2012).
- In June 2012, in granting plaintiffs’ motion for class certification, the Honorable Inge Prytz Johnson noted that other courts have referred to Robbins Geller as ““one of the most successful law firms in securities class actions . . . in the country.”” *Local 703, I.B. v. Regions Fin. Corp.*, 282 F.R.D. 607, 616 (N.D. Ala. 2012) (quoting *In re Enron Corp. Sec. Litig.*, 586 F. Supp. 2d 732, 797 (S.D. Tex. 2008)), *aff’d in part and vacated in part on other grounds*, 762 F.3d 1248 (11th Cir. 2014).
- In June 2012, in granting final approval of the settlement, the Honorable Barbara S. Jones commented that “class counsel’s representation, from the work that I saw, appeared to me to be of the highest quality.” *In re CIT Grp. Inc. Sec. Litig.*, No. 08 Civ. 6613, Transcript at 9:16-18 (S.D.N.Y. June 13, 2012).
- In March 2012, in granting certification for the class, Judge Robert W. Sweet referenced the *Enron* case, agreeing that Robbins Geller’s ““clearly superlative litigating and negotiating skills”” give the Firm an ““outstanding reputation, experience, and success in securities litigation nationwide,”” thus, “[t]he experience, ability, and reputation of the attorneys of [Robbins Geller] is not disputed; it is one of the most successful law firms in securities class actions, if not the preeminent one, in the country.”” *Billhofer v. Flamei Techs., S.A.*, 281 F.R.D. 150, 158 (S.D.N.Y. 2012).
- In March 2011, in denying defendants’ motion to dismiss, Judge Richard Sullivan commented: “Let me thank you all. . . . [The motion] was well argued . . . and . . . well briefed I certainly appreciate having good lawyers who put the time in to be prepared” *Anegada Master Fund Ltd. v. PxRE Grp. Ltd.*, No. 08-cv-10584, Transcript at 83 (S.D.N.Y. Mar. 16, 2011).

- In January 2011, the court praised Robbins Geller attorneys: “They have gotten very good results for stockholders. . . . [Robbins Geller has] such a good track record.” *In re Compellent Technologies, Inc. S’holder Litig.*, No. 6084-VCL, Transcript at 20-21 (Del. Ch. Jan. 13, 2011).
- In August 2010, in reviewing the settlement papers submitted by the Firm, Judge Carlos Murguia stated that Robbins Geller performed “a commendable job of addressing the relevant issues with great detail and in a comprehensive manner The court respects the [Firm’s] experience in the field of derivative [litigation].” *Alaska Elec. Pension Fund v. Olofson*, No. 08-cv-02344-CM-JPO (D. Kan.) (Aug. 20, 2010 e-mail from court re: settlement papers).
- In June 2009, Judge Ira Warshawsky praised the Firm’s efforts in *In re Aeroflex, Inc. S’holder Litig.*: “There is no doubt that the law firms involved in this matter represented in my opinion the cream of the crop of class action business law and mergers and acquisition litigators, and from a judicial point of view it was a pleasure working with them.” *In re Aeroflex, Inc. S’holder Litig.*, No. 003943/07, Transcript at 25:14-18 (N.Y. Sup. Ct., Nassau Cty. June 30, 2009).
- In March 2009, in granting class certification, the Honorable Robert Sweet of the Southern District of New York commented in *In re NYSE Specialists Sec. Litig.*, 260 F.R.D. 55, 74 (S.D.N.Y. 2009): “As to the second prong, the Specialist Firms have not challenged, in this motion, the qualifications, experience, or ability of counsel for Lead Plaintiff, [Robbins Geller], to conduct this litigation. Given [Robbins Geller’s] substantial experience in securities class action litigation and the extensive discovery already conducted in this case, this element of adequacy has also been satisfied.”
- In June 2008, the court commented, “Plaintiffs’ lead counsel in this litigation, [Robbins Geller], has demonstrated its considerable expertise in shareholder litigation, diligently advocating the rights of Home Depot shareholders in this Litigation. [Robbins Geller] has acted with substantial skill and professionalism in representing the plaintiffs and the interests of Home Depot and its shareholders in prosecuting this case.” *City of Pontiac General Employees’ Ret. Sys. v. Langone*, No. 2006-122302, Findings of Fact in Support of Order and Final Judgment at 2 (Ga. Super. Ct., Fulton Cty. June 10, 2008).
- In a December 2006 hearing on the \$50 million consumer privacy class action settlement in *Kehoe v. Fidelity Fed. Bank & Tr.*, No. 03-80593-CIV (S.D. Fla.), United States District Court Judge Daniel T.K. Hurley said the following:

First, I thank counsel. As I said repeatedly on both sides, we have been very, very fortunate. We have had fine lawyers on both sides. The issues in the case are significant issues. We are talking about issues dealing with consumer protection and privacy. Something that is increasingly important today in our society. . . . I want you to know I thought long and hard about this. I am absolutely satisfied that the settlement is a fair and reasonable settlement. . . . I thank the lawyers on both sides for the extraordinary effort that has been brought to bear here

Kehoe v. Fidelity Fed. Bank & Tr., No. 03-80593-CIV, Transcript at 26, 28-29 (S.D. Fla. Dec. 7, 2006).

- In *Stanley v. Safeskin Corp.*, No. 99 CV 454 (S.D. Cal.), where Robbins Geller attorneys obtained \$55 million for the class of investors, Judge Moskowitz stated:

I said this once before, and I'll say it again. I thought the way that your firm handled this case was outstanding. This was not an easy case. It was a complicated case, and every step of the way, I thought they did a very professional job.

Stanley v. Safeskin Corp., No. 99 CV 454, Transcript at 13 (S.D. Cal. May 25, 2004).

Precedent-Setting Decisions

Robbins Geller attorneys operate at the forefront of litigation. Our work often changes the legal landscape, resulting in an environment that is more-favorable for obtaining recoveries for our clients.

Investor and Shareholder Rights

- ***Cyan, Inc. v. Beaver County Employees Retirement Fund***, No. 15-1439 (U.S.). In March 2018, the Supreme Court ruled in favor of investors represented by Robbins Geller, holding that state courts continue to have jurisdiction over class actions asserting violations of the Securities Act of 1933. The Court's ruling secures investors' ability to bring 1933 Act actions when companies fail to make full and fair disclosure of relevant information in offering documents. The Court confirmed that the Securities Litigation Uniform Standards Act of 1998 was designed to preclude securities class actions asserting violations of state law – not to preclude securities actions asserting federal law violations brought in state courts.
- ***Mineworkers' Pension Scheme v. First Solar Inc.***, No. 15-17282 (9th Cir.).
- In January 2018, the Ninth Circuit upheld the district court's denial of defendants' motion for summary judgment, agreeing with plaintiffs that the test for loss causation in the Ninth Circuit is a general "proximate cause test," and rejecting the more stringent revelation of the fraudulent practices standard advocated by the defendants. The opinion is a significant victory for investors, as it forecloses defendants' ability to immunize themselves from liability simply by refusing to publicly acknowledge their fraudulent conduct.
- ***In re Quality Systems, Inc. Sec. Litig.***, No. 15-55173 (9th Cir.).
- In July 2017, Robbins Geller's Appellate Practice Group scored a significant win in the Ninth Circuit in the *Quality Systems* securities class action. On appeal, a three-judge Ninth Circuit panel unanimously reversed the district court's prior dismissal of the action against Quality Systems and remanded the case to the district court for further proceedings. The decision addressed an issue of first impression concerning "mixed" future and present-tense misstatements. The appellate panel explained that "non-forward-looking portions of mixed statements are not eligible for the safe harbor provisions of the PSLRA Defendants made a number of mixed statements that included projections of growth in revenue and earnings based on the state of QSI's sales pipeline." The panel then held *both* the non-forward-looking and forward-looking statements false and misleading and made with scienter, deeming them actionable. Later, although defendants sought rehearing by the Ninth Circuit sitting *en banc*, the circuit court denied their petition.
- ***Omnicare, Inc. v. Laborers District Council Construction Industry Pension Fund***, No. 13-435 (U.S.).
- In March 2015, the Supreme Court ruled in favor of investors represented by Robbins Geller that investors asserting a claim under §11 of the Securities Act of 1933 with respect to a misleading statement of opinion do not, as defendant Omnicare had contended, have to prove that the statement was subjectively disbelieved when made. Rather, the Court held that a statement of opinion

may be actionable either because it was not believed, or because it lacked a reasonable basis in fact. This decision is significant in that it resolved a conflict among the federal circuit courts and expressly overruled the Second Circuit's widely followed, more stringent pleading standard for §11 claims involving statements of opinion. The Supreme Court remanded the case back to the district court for determination under the newly articulated standard. In August of 2016, upon remand, the district court applied the Supreme Court's new test and denied defendants' motion to dismiss in full.

- **NECA-IBEW Health & Welfare Fund v. Goldman Sachs & Co.**, 693 F.3d 145 (2d Cir. 2012). In a securities fraud action involving mortgage-backed securities, the Second Circuit rejected the concept of "tranche" standing and found that a lead plaintiff has class standing to pursue claims on behalf of purchasers of securities that were backed by pools of mortgages originated by the same lenders who had originated mortgages backing the lead plaintiff's securities. The court noted that, given those common lenders, the lead plaintiff's claims as to its purchases implicated "the same set of concerns" that purchasers in several of the other offerings possessed. The court also rejected the notion that the lead plaintiff lacked standing to represent investors in different tranches.
- **In re VeriFone Holdings, Inc. Sec. Litig.**, 704 F.3d 694 (9th Cir. 2012). The panel reversed in part and affirmed in part the dismissal of investors' securities fraud class action alleging violations of §§10(b), 20(a), and 20A of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 and SEC Rule 10b-5 in connection with a restatement of financial results of the company in which the investors had purchased stock.

The panel held that the third amended complaint adequately pleaded the §10(b), §20A and Rule 10b-5 claims. Considering the allegations of scienter holistically, as the U.S. Supreme Court directed in *Matrixx Initiatives, Inc. v. Siracusano*, 563 U.S. 27, 48-49 (2011), the panel concluded that the inference that the defendant company and its chief executive officer and former chief financial officer were deliberately reckless as to the truth of their financial reports and related public statements following a merger was at least as compelling as any opposing inference.

- **Fox v. JAMDAT Mobile, Inc.**, 185 Cal. App. 4th 1068 (2010). Concluding that Delaware's shareholder ratification doctrine did not bar the claims, the California Court of Appeal reversed dismissal of a shareholder class action alleging breach of fiduciary duty in a corporate merger.
- **In re Constar Int'l Inc. Sec. Litig.**, 585 F.3d 774 (3d Cir. 2009). The Third Circuit flatly rejected defense contentions that where relief is sought under §11 of the Securities Act of 1933, which imposes liability when securities are issued pursuant to an incomplete or misleading registration statement, class certification should depend upon findings concerning market efficiency and loss causation.
- **Matrixx Initiatives, Inc. v. Siracusano**, 563 U.S 27 (2011), aff'g 585 F.3d 1167 (9th Cir. 2009). In a securities fraud action involving the defendants' failure to disclose a possible link between the company's popular cold remedy and a life-altering side effect observed in some users, the U.S. Supreme Court unanimously affirmed the Ninth Circuit's (a) rejection of a bright-line "statistical significance" materiality standard, and (b) holding that plaintiffs had successfully pleaded a strong inference of the defendants' scienter.
- **Alaska Elec. Pension Fund v. Flowserv Corp.**, 572 F.3d 221 (5th Cir. 2009). Aided by former U.S. Supreme Court Justice O'Connor's presence on the panel, the Fifth Circuit reversed a district court order denying class certification and also reversed an order granting summary judgment to defendants. The court held that the district court applied an incorrect fact-for-fact standard of loss causation, and that genuine issues of fact on loss causation precluded summary judgment.

- ***In re F5 Networks, Inc., Derivative Litig.***, 207 P.3d 433 (Wash. 2009). In a derivative action alleging unlawful stock option backdating, the Supreme Court of Washington ruled that shareholders need not make a pre-suit demand on the board of directors where this step would be futile, agreeing with plaintiffs that favorable Delaware case law should be followed as persuasive authority.
- ***Lormand v. US Unwired, Inc.***, 565 F.3d 228 (5th Cir. 2009). In a rare win for investors in the Fifth Circuit, the court reversed an order of dismissal, holding that safe harbor warnings were not meaningful when the facts alleged established a strong inference that defendants knew their forecasts were false. The court also held that plaintiffs sufficiently alleged loss causation.
- ***Institutional Inv'rs Grp. v. Avaya, Inc.***, 564 F.3d 242 (3d Cir. 2009). In a victory for investors in the Third Circuit, the court reversed an order of dismissal, holding that shareholders pled with particularity why the company's repeated denials of price discounts on products were false and misleading when the totality of facts alleged established a strong inference that defendants knew their denials were false.
- ***Alaska Elec. Pension Fund v. Pharmacia Corp.***, 554 F.3d 342 (3d Cir. 2009). The Third Circuit held that claims filed for violation of §10(b) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 were timely, adopting investors' argument that because scienter is a critical element of the claims, the time for filing them cannot begin to run until the defendants' fraudulent state of mind should be apparent.
- ***Rael v. Page***, 222 P.3d 678 (N.M. Ct. App. 2009). In this shareholder class and derivative action, Robbins Geller attorneys obtained an appellate decision reversing the trial court's dismissal of the complaint alleging serious director misconduct in connection with the merger of SunCal Companies and Westland Development Co., Inc., a New Mexico company with large and historic landholdings and other assets in the Albuquerque area. The appellate court held that plaintiff's claims for breach of fiduciary duty were direct, not derivative, because they constituted an attack on the validity or fairness of the merger and the conduct of the directors. Although New Mexico law had not addressed this question directly, at the urging of the Firm's attorneys, the court relied on Delaware law for guidance, rejecting the "special injury" test for determining the direct versus derivative inquiry and instead applying more recent Delaware case law.
- ***Lane v. Page***, No. 06-cv-1071 (D.N.M. 2012). In May 2012, while granting final approval of the settlement in the federal component of the Westland cases, Judge Browning in the District of New Mexico commented:

Class Counsel are highly skilled and specialized attorneys who use their substantial experience and expertise to prosecute complex securities class actions. In possibly one of the best known and most prominent recent securities cases, Robbins Geller served as sole lead counsel – *In re Enron Corp. Sec. Litig.*, No. H-01-3624 (S.D. Tex.). See Report at 3. The Court has previously noted that the class would "receive high caliber legal representation" from class counsel, and throughout the course of the litigation the Court has been impressed with the quality of representation on each side. *Lane v. Page*, 250 F.R.D. at 647.

Lane v. Page, 862 F. Supp. 2d 1182, 1253-54 (D.N.M. 2012).

In addition, Judge Browning stated, "Few plaintiffs' law firms could have devoted the kind of time, skill, and financial resources over a five-year period necessary to achieve the pre- and post-Merger benefits obtained for the class here.' . . . [Robbins Geller is] both skilled and experienced, and used those skills and experience for the benefit of the class [Robbins Geller is] both skilled and experienced, and used those skills and experience for the benefit of the class." *Id.* at 1254.

- **Luther v. Countrywide Home Loans Servicing LP**, 533 F.3d 1031 (9th Cir. 2008). In a case of first impression, the Ninth Circuit held that the Securities Act of 1933's specific non-removal features had not been trumped by the general removal provisions of the Class Action Fairness Act of 2005.
- **In re Gilead Scis. Sec. Litig.**, 536 F.3d 1049 (9th Cir. 2008). The Ninth Circuit upheld defrauded investors' loss causation theory as plausible, ruling that a limited temporal gap between the time defendants' misrepresentation was publicly revealed and the subsequent decline in stock value was reasonable where the public had not immediately understood the impact of defendants' fraud.
- **In re WorldCom Sec. Litig.**, 496 F.3d 245 (2d Cir. 2007). The Second Circuit held that the filing of a class action complaint tolls the limitations period for all members of the class, including those who choose to opt out of the class action and file their own individual actions without waiting to see whether the district court certifies a class – reversing the decision below and effectively overruling multiple district court rulings that *American Pipe* tolling did not apply under these circumstances.
- **In re Merck & Co. Sec., Derivative & ERISA Litig.**, 493 F.3d 393 (3d Cir. 2007). In a shareholder derivative suit appeal, the Third Circuit held that the general rule that discovery may not be used to supplement demand-futility allegations does not apply where the defendants enter a voluntary stipulation to produce materials relevant to demand futility without providing for any limitation as to their use. In April 2007, the Honorable D. Brooks Smith praised Robbins Geller partner Joe Daley's efforts in this litigation:

Thank you very much Mr. Daley and a thank you to all counsel. As Judge Cowen mentioned, this was an exquisitely well-briefed case; it was also an extremely well-argued case, and we thank counsel for their respective jobs here in the matter, which we will take under advisement. Thank you.

In re Merck & Co., Inc. Sec., Derivative & ERISA Litig., No. 06-2911, Transcript at 35:37-36:00 (3d Cir. Apr. 12, 2007).

- **Alaska Elec. Pension Fund v. Brown**, 941 A.2d 1011 (Del. 2007). The Supreme Court of Delaware held that the Alaska Electrical Pension Fund, for purposes of the "corporate benefit" attorney-fee doctrine, was presumed to have caused a substantial increase in the tender offer price paid in a "going private" buyout transaction. The Court of Chancery originally ruled that Alaska's counsel, Robbins Geller, was not entitled to an award of attorney fees, but Delaware's high court, in its published opinion, reversed and remanded for further proceedings.
- **Crandon Capital Partners v. Shelk**, 157 P.3d 176 (Or. 2007). Oregon's Supreme Court ruled that a shareholder plaintiff in a derivative action may still seek attorney fees even if the defendants took actions to moot the underlying claims. The Firm's attorneys convinced Oregon's highest court to take the case, and reverse, despite the contrary position articulated by both the trial court and the Oregon Court of Appeals.
- **In re Qwest Commc'n's Int'l**, 450 F.3d 1179 (10th Cir. 2006). In a case of first impression, the Tenth Circuit held that a corporation's deliberate release of purportedly privileged materials to governmental agencies was not a "selective waiver" of the privileges such that the corporation could refuse to produce the same materials to non-governmental plaintiffs in private securities fraud litigation.

- ***In re Guidant S'holders Derivative Litig.***, 841 N.E.2d 571 (Ind. 2006). Answering a certified question from a federal court, the Supreme Court of Indiana unanimously held that a pre-suit demand in a derivative action is excused if the demand would be a futile gesture. The court adopted a “demand futility” standard and rejected defendants’ call for a “universal demand” standard that might have immediately ended the case.
- ***Denver Area Meat Cutters v. Clayton***, 209 S.W.3d 584 (Tenn. Ct. App. 2006). The Tennessee Court of Appeals rejected an objector’s challenge to a class action settlement arising out of Warren Buffet’s 2003 acquisition of Tennessee-based Clayton Homes. In their effort to secure relief for Clayton Homes stockholders, the Firm’s attorneys obtained a temporary injunction of the Buffet acquisition for six weeks in 2003 while the matter was litigated in the courts. The temporary halt to Buffet’s acquisition received national press attention.
- ***DeJulius v. New Eng. Health Care Emps. Pension Fund***, 429 F.3d 935 (10th Cir. 2005). The Tenth Circuit held that the multi-faceted notice of a \$50 million settlement in a securities fraud class action had been the best notice practicable under the circumstances, and thus satisfied both constitutional due process and Rule 23 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.
- ***In re Daou Sys.***, 411 F.3d 1006 (9th Cir. 2005). The Ninth Circuit sustained investors’ allegations of accounting fraud and ruled that loss causation was adequately alleged by pleading that the value of the stock they purchased declined when the issuer’s true financial condition was revealed.
- ***Barrie v. Intervoice-Brite, Inc.***, 397 F.3d 249 (5th Cir.), *reh'g denied and opinion modified*, 409 F.3d 653 (5th Cir. 2005). The Fifth Circuit upheld investors’ accounting-fraud claims, holding that fraud is pled as to both defendants when one knowingly utters a false statement and the other knowingly fails to correct it, even if the complaint does not specify who spoke and who listened.
- ***City of Monroe Emps. Ret. Sys. v. Bridgestone Corp.***, 399 F.3d 651 (6th Cir. 2005). The Sixth Circuit held that a statement regarding objective data supposedly supporting a corporation’s belief that its tires were safe was actionable where jurors could have found a reasonable basis to believe the corporation was aware of undisclosed facts seriously undermining the statement’s accuracy.
- ***Ill. Mun. Ret. Fund v. Citigroup, Inc.***, 391 F.3d 844 (7th Cir. 2004). The Seventh Circuit upheld a district court’s decision that the Illinois Municipal Retirement Fund was entitled to litigate its claims under the Securities Act of 1933 against WorldCom’s underwriters before a state court rather than before the federal forum sought by the defendants.
- ***Nursing Home Pension Fund, Local 144 v. Oracle Corp.***, 380 F.3d 1226 (9th Cir. 2004). The Ninth Circuit ruled that defendants’ fraudulent intent could be inferred from allegations concerning their false representations, insider stock sales and improper accounting methods.
- ***Southland Sec. Corp. v. INSpire Ins. Sols. Inc.***, 365 F.3d 353 (5th Cir. 2004). The Fifth Circuit sustained allegations that an issuer’s CEO made fraudulent statements in connection with a contract announcement.

Consumer Protection

- **Kwikset Corp. v. Superior Court**, 51 Cal. 4th 310 (2011). In a leading decision interpreting the scope of Proposition 64's new standing requirements under California's Unfair Competition Law (UCL), the California Supreme Court held that consumers alleging that a manufacturer has misrepresented its product have "lost money or property" within the meaning of the initiative, and thus have standing to sue under the UCL, if they "can truthfully allege that they were deceived by a product's label into spending money to purchase the product, and would not have purchased it otherwise." *Id.* at 317. *Kwikset* involved allegations, proven at trial, that defendants violated California's "Made in the U.S.A." statute by representing on their labels that their products were "Made in U.S.A." or "All-American Made" when, in fact, the products were substantially made with foreign parts and labor.
- **Safeco Ins. Co. of Am. v. Superior Court**, 173 Cal. App. 4th 814 (2009). In a class action against auto insurer Safeco, the California Court of Appeal agreed that the plaintiff should have access to discovery to identify a new class representative after her standing to sue was challenged.
- **Consumer Privacy Cases**, 175 Cal. App. 4th 545 (2009). The California Court of Appeal rejected objections to a nationwide class action settlement benefiting Bank of America customers.
- **Koponen v. Pac. Gas & Elec. Co.**, 165 Cal. App. 4th 345 (2008). The Firm's attorneys obtained a published decision reversing the trial court's dismissal of the action, and holding that the plaintiff's claims for damages arising from the utility's unauthorized use of rights-of-way or easements obtained from the plaintiff and other landowners were not barred by a statute limiting the authority of California courts to review or correct decisions of the California Public Utilities Commission.
- **Sanford v. MemberWorks, Inc.**, 483 F.3d 956 (9th Cir. 2007). In a telemarketing-fraud case, where the plaintiff consumer insisted she had never entered the contractual arrangement that defendants said bound her to arbitrate individual claims to the exclusion of pursuing class claims, the Ninth Circuit reversed an order compelling arbitration – allowing the plaintiff to litigate on behalf of a class.
- **Ritt v. Billy Blanks Enters.**, 870 N.E.2d 212 (Ohio Ct. App. 2007). In the Ohio analog to the *West* case, the Ohio Court of Appeals approved certification of a class of Ohio residents seeking relief under Ohio's consumer protection laws for the same telemarketing fraud.
- **Haw. Med. Ass'n v. Haw. Med. Serv. Ass'n**, 148 P.3d 1179 (Haw. 2006). The Supreme Court of Hawaii ruled that claims of unfair competition were not subject to arbitration and that claims of tortious interference with prospective economic advantage were adequately alleged.
- **Branick v. Downey Sav. & Loan Ass'n**, 39 Cal. 4th 235 (2006). Robbins Geller attorneys were part of a team of lawyers that briefed this case before the Supreme Court of California. The court issued a unanimous decision holding that new plaintiffs may be substituted, if necessary, to preserve actions pending when Proposition 64 was passed by California voters in 2004. Proposition 64 amended California's Unfair Competition Law and was aggressively cited by defense lawyers in an effort to dismiss cases after the initiative was adopted.
- **McKell v. Wash. Mut., Inc.**, 142 Cal. App. 4th 1457 (2006). The California Court of Appeal reversed the trial court, holding that plaintiff's theories attacking a variety of allegedly inflated mortgage-related fees were actionable.

- **West Corp. v. Superior Court**, 116 Cal. App. 4th 1167 (2004). The California Court of Appeal upheld the trial court's finding that jurisdiction in California was appropriate over the out-of-state corporate defendant whose telemarketing was aimed at California residents. Exercise of jurisdiction was found to be in keeping with considerations of fair play and substantial justice.
- **Kruse v. Wells Fargo Home Mortg., Inc.**, 383 F.3d 49 (2d Cir. 2004), and **Santiago v. GMAC Mortg. Grp., Inc.**, 417 F.3d 384 (3d Cir. 2005). In two groundbreaking federal appellate decisions, the Second and Third Circuits each ruled that the Real Estate Settlement Practices Act prohibits marking up home loan-related fees and charges.

Insurance

- **Smith v. Am. Family Mut. Ins. Co.**, 289 S.W.3d 675 (Mo. Ct. App. 2009). Capping nearly a decade of hotly contested litigation, the Missouri Court of Appeals reversed the trial court's judgment notwithstanding the verdict for auto insurer American Family and reinstated a unanimous jury verdict for the plaintiff class.
- **Troyk v. Farmers Grp., Inc.**, 171 Cal. App. 4th 1305 (2009). The California Court of Appeal held that Farmers Insurance's practice of levying a "service charge" on one-month auto insurance policies, without specifying the charge in the policy, violated California's Insurance Code.
- **Lebrilla v. Farmers Grp., Inc.**, 119 Cal. App. 4th 1070 (2004). Reversing the trial court, the California Court of Appeal ordered class certification of a suit against Farmers, one of the largest automobile insurers in California, and ruled that Farmers' standard automobile policy requires it to provide parts that are as good as those made by vehicle's manufacturer. The case involved Farmers' practice of using inferior imitation parts when repairing insureds' vehicles.
- **In re Monumental Life Ins. Co.**, 365 F.3d 408, 416 (5th Cir. 2004). The Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals reversed a district court's denial of class certification in a case filed by African-Americans seeking to remedy racially discriminatory insurance practices. The Fifth Circuit held that a monetary relief claim is viable in a Rule 23(b)(2) class if it flows directly from liability to the class as a whole and is capable of classwide "computation by means of objective standards and not dependent in any significant way on the intangible, subjective differences of each class member's circumstances."

Attorney Biographies

James E. Barz | Partner

James Barz is a partner at the Firm and manages the Firm's Chicago office. He is a registered CPA, a former federal prosecutor, and he has been an adjunct professor at Northwestern University School of Law from 2008 to 2017, teaching courses on trial advocacy and class action litigation. Barz has focused on representing investors in securities fraud class actions that have resulted in recoveries of over \$900 million, including: *HCA* (\$215 million, M.D. Tenn.); *Motorola* (\$200 million, N.D. Ill.); *Sprint* (\$131 million, D. Kan.); *Psychiatric Solutions* (\$65 million, M.D. Tenn.); Dana Corp. (\$64 million, N.D. Ohio); and *Hospira* (\$60 million, N.D. Ill.). He has been lead or co-lead trial counsel in several of these cases obtaining favorable settlements just days or weeks before trial and after obtaining denials of summary judgment. Barz is currently representing investors in securities fraud litigation against Valeant Pharmaceuticals Inc. (D.N.J.). Barz also handles whistleblower, antitrust, and consumer class actions and has responsibilities for Firm training and professional responsibility matters.

Prior to joining the Firm, Barz was a partner at Mayer Brown LLP from 2006 to 2011 and an associate from 1998 to 2002. At Mayer Brown, Barz handled commercial litigation, internal investigations, and antitrust cases. Barz was also active in their pro bono program where, in his first jury trial, he won an acquittal on all charges and, in his first appeal, he obtained the reversal of a conviction based on the trial judge having solicited a bribe. From 2002 to 2006 he served as an Assistant United States Attorney in Chicago, trying cases and supervising investigations involving public corruption, financial frauds, tax offenses, money laundering, and drug and firearm offenses. He successfully obtained a conviction against every defendant who went to trial.

Education

B.B.A., Loyola University Chicago, School of Business Administration, 1995; J.D., Northwestern University School of Law, 1998

Honors / Awards

Super Lawyer, 2018; B.B.A., *Summa Cum Laude*, Loyola University Chicago, School of Business Administration, 1995; J.D., *Cum Laude*, Northwestern University School of Law, 1998

Alexandra S. Bernay | Partner

Xan Bernay is a partner in the Firm's San Diego office, where she specializes in antitrust and unfair competition class-action litigation. She has also worked on some of the Firm's largest securities fraud class actions, including the *Enron* litigation, which recovered an unprecedented \$7.2 billion for investors. Bernay's current practice focuses on the prosecution of antitrust and consumer fraud cases. In *In re Payment Card Interchange Fee and Merchant Discount Antitrust Litig.* Bernay serves as co-lead counsel. That case, pending in the Eastern District of New York, is brought on behalf of millions of U.S. merchants against Visa and MasterCard and various card-issuing banks.

Additionally, Bernay is involved in antitrust cases on behalf of various generic drug purchasers who allege a wide-ranging scheme against major drug companies. She is also a member of the team in *In re Digital Music Antitrust Litig.*, pending in the Southern District of New York. In the past, Bernay was actively involved in the consumer action on behalf of bank customers who were overcharged for debit card transactions. That case, *In re Checking Account Overdraft Litig.*, resulted in more than \$500 million in settlements with major banks that manipulated customers' debit transactions to maximize overdraft fees.

Education

B.A., Humboldt State University, 1997; J.D., University of San Diego School of Law, 2000

Honors / Awards

Litigator of the Week, *Global Competition Review*, October 1, 2014

Carmen A. Medici | Partner

Carmen Medici is a partner in the Firm's San Diego office and focuses on complex antitrust class action litigation and unfair competition law. He represents businesses and consumers who are the victims of price-fixing, monopolization, collusion, and other anticompetitive and unfair business practices. Medici specializes in litigation against giants in the financial sector, and has worked on behalf of merchants in payment card cases for a decade. A veteran of litigation in the credit card industry, Medici is currently representing merchants in *In re Payment Card Interchange Fee and Merchant Discount Litigation*, a large-scale case charging Visa, MasterCard and the country's major banks with antitrust violations related to the allegedly collusive way rules are set in the industry, including rules requiring payment of ever-increasing interchange fees by merchants. He is also a part of the co-lead counsel team in *In re SSA Bonds Antitrust Litig.*, pending in the Southern District of New York, representing bond purchasers who were defrauded by a brazen price-fixing scheme perpetrated at some of the nation's largest banks.

In federal district court in New Jersey, Medici litigates *Lincoln Adventures, LLC v. Those Certain Underwriters at Lloyd's London*, where he represents buyers of insurance in an antitrust action against insurance companies in the London market. He is also a member of the co-lead litigation team in *In re Aluminum Warehousing Antitrust Litig.*, currently on appeal before the Second Circuit. He is also a member of the team in *In re Digital Music Antitrust Litig.*, pending in the Southern District of New York. In the past, Medici was a member of the discovery team in *In re NCAA Student-Athlete Name & Likeness Licensing Litig.*, which culminated in a trial victory for student athletes against the NCAA. He was also on the litigation team in *In re Fresh & Process Potatoes Antitrust Litig.*, which resulted in a multi-million dollar settlement. In addition, he is involved in a number of the Firm's other major antitrust and consumer actions. Medici regularly identifies and pursues potential new antitrust matters and drafts complaints on behalf of individual and class plaintiffs.

Education

B.S., Arizona State University, 2003; J.D., University of San Diego School of Law, 2006

Honors / Awards

Super Lawyer "Rising Star," 2015-2017

David W. Mitchell | Partner

David Mitchell is a partner in the Firm's San Diego office and focuses his practice on securities fraud, antitrust and derivative litigation. He leads the Firm's antitrust benchmark litigations as well as the Firm's pay-for-delay actions. He has served as lead or co-lead counsel in numerous cases and has helped achieve substantial settlements for shareholders. His recent cases include *Dahl v. Bain Capital Partners, LLC*, obtaining more than \$590 million for shareholders, and *In re Payment Card Interchange Fee and Merchant Discount Antitrust Litig.* Currently, Mitchell serves as court-appointed counsel in the ISDAfix Benchmark action and *In re Aluminum Warehousing Antitrust Litig.*

Prior to joining the Firm, he served as an Assistant United States Attorney in the Southern District of California and prosecuted cases involving narcotics trafficking, bank robbery, murder-for-hire, alien smuggling, and terrorism. Mitchell has tried nearly 20 cases to verdict before federal criminal juries and made numerous appellate arguments before the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals.

Education

B.A., University of Richmond, 1995; J.D., University of San Diego School of Law, 1998

Honors / Awards

Member, Enright Inn of Court; Best Lawyer in America, *Best Lawyers®*, 2018; Super Lawyer, 2016-2017; Antitrust Trailblazer, *The National Law Journal*, 2015; "Best of the Bar," *San Diego Business Journal*, 2014